Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-136
Tuesday
16 July 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-136 CONTENTS 16 July 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Senate To Consider Ratification of CFE *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* 1
Bush Letter Urges CFE Treaty's Ratification *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jul]* 1
Chemical Weapons Destruction Program Not Endorsed *[Moscow Radio]* 2
U.S. Team Inspects Kazakhstan Munitions Factory *[TASS]* 2
U.S. Satisfied With Kiev Monitoring Visit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jul]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gorbachev Talks With G-7 in London Previewed 3
  Ignatenko, Shcherbakov Comment *[TASS]* 3
  Shcherbakov on Expectations *[Moscow TV]* 3
  Primakov, Sitaryan on Prospects *[PRAVDA 16 Jul]* 4
  Zaraelyan: World's Future Dependent on Talks *[Moscow TV]* 4
  Bovin: 'Difficult' 'Success' for Gorbachev *[IZVESTIYA 13 Jul]* 5
  'No Miracle' Expected *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 7
  'Blank Check' Not Expected *[PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 8
Shcherbakov Seeks Western Energy Investments *[Paris Radio]* 9
TASS Interviews UK's Hogg on G-7, Iraq 9
Paris UNSC Talks on Arms Trade Viewed *[PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 10
Common European Home Seen as Unsustainable *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jul]* 11

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Bessmertnykh, Delegation on Talks in U.S. 13
  Report on Talks *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jul]* 13
  TASS Reviews Talks 15
  'Good Chance' for July Treaty Completion *[Moscow International]* 17
  Further Comments on Talks *[Moscow TV]* 17
  Depart Washington 15 July *[TASS]* 18
  Comments on Talks With U.S. *[TASS]* 18
  Further Comment *[Moscow Radio]* 19

China

Dalai Lama Arrives in Buryatia *[TASS]* 19
Official on Science Cooperation With China *[Moscow International]* 20

Northeast Asia

Japanese Envoy Meets President Gorbachev *[INTERFAX]* 20
Suzuki, Popov Sign Friendship Agreement *[Tokyo KYODO]* 21
Japan's Press on Yavlinskiy's Reform Plan *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jul]* 21
Mongolian Party Celebrates 70th Anniversary 21
  CPSU Secretariat Offers Congratulations *[PRAVDA 11 Jul]* 21
  Mongolian President on Progress, Ties *[PRAVDA 11 Jul]* 21
  Anniversary Reception Held *[PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 24

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- Rogachev Leaves For, Comments on Cambodia Talks *[TASS]* 24
- Report on Cambodian Peace Settlement *[TASS]* 24
- Assessment of China's Role in Cambodian Conflict *[Moscow International]* 25
- Shenin Meets Delegates at CPV Congress *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 25
- Economic Relations With Vietnam Pondered *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 26

Near East & South Asia

- Reportage on Iraqi Nuclear Issue 28
  - U.S. 'Logic' in Threats Noted *[TASS]* 28
  - Iraqi Explanation Carries 'Little Weight' *[Moscow International]* 29
  - Moscow Urges Iraqi Disclosure *[Moscow International]* 29
- Bangladesh Foreign Minister Pays Visit 29
  - Meets Sobchak, Trade Minister *[Dhaka Radio]* 29
  - Communique on Visit *[TASS]* 30
- Report on Kidnapped Soviet Engineer's Death *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jul]* 30
  - Separatists Refuse To Hand Over Body *[TASS]* 31
- Indian-Soviet Journalists Association Meets *[TASS]* 31
- Analyst Criticizes Afghan Communique *[TASS]* 32
- S. Lebanon Problem Seen in Context of Settlement *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* 32

Sub-Saharan Africa

- Policy Directions, Goals in RSA Debated *[NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA 27 Jun]* 33
- Government Watching South African Situation *[INTERFAX]* 36
- Gorbachev Congratulations to Mandela Published *[PRAVDA 10 Jul]* 36
- Examination of Problems Hindering Angolan Peace *[IZVESTIYA 9 Jul]* 37

East Europe

- EC Efforts on Yugoslavia Said 'Useful' *[INTERFAX]* 37
- 'Fratricidal War' in Yugoslavia Reported *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 10 Jul]* 38
- Bulgarian Army Chief on Military Doctrine *[Moscow Radio]* 39
- Falin Holds News Conference in Warsaw 12 Jul *[ZYCIE WARSZAWY 13-14 Jul]* 39
  - Report on Visit *[TASS]* 40
- Soviet Battalion Starts Withdrawal From Poland *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Jul]* 40

West Europe

- 12 Nuclear Missiles Removed From Germany *[Berlin ADN]* 40
- German Defense Official Cited on Cooperation *[TASS]* 40
- UK's Hurd Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jul]* 41
- Bessmertnykh Letter to Austria's Mock on SFRY *[Vienna PROFIL 15 Jul]* 42
- Government to Sign Friendship Treaty With Greece *[INTERFAX]* 42
- Belgian Ground Forces Chief of Staff Visits *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Jul]* 43
- Soviet Ships on Courtesy Call in Helsinki *[Moscow TV]* 43
- Further Reportage on Gonzalez Visit to Moscow *[Madrid Radio]* 43
- Gorbachev 5 June Speech for Norwegian King *[TASS]* 44

Latin America & Caribbean

- Commentator on Relations With Paraguay *[Moscow International]* 45
- Chilean President Invites Gorbachev To Visit *[INTERFAX]* 45
- El Salvador Denies Entry to Correspondent *[TASS]* 46
- Aldana, Cuban Delegation End Moscow Visit 3 Jul *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* 46
- Soviet Warships Sail Through Sargasso Sea *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jul]* 46

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Deputies Debate Nishanov Union Treaty Report *[PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 47
Nishanov Answers Questions on Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 49
Soyuz Group To Demand Vote on Union Treaty *[TASS]* 50
Resolution on Resources for Harvesting Issued *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jul]* 51
Antimonopoly Legislation Discussed *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jul]* 51
Deputies Debate Privileges, Benefits *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 9 Jul]* 52
IZVESTIYA Reports Fifth Session's End *[15 Jul]* 54

Political & Social

Internal Affairs Minister Pugo Interviewed *[Moscow Radio]* 58
Gorbachev Message Hails War Veterans *[PRAVDA 13 Jul]* 64
CPSU Control Commission To Assess Dacha Abuse *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Jul]* 65
'Democratic Reforms Movement' 'Nothing Unusual' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Jul]* 65
IZVESTIYA Examines Novo-Ogarevo Accord *[12 Jul]* 65
Bolsheviks Urge Loyalty to 'True Socialism' *[TASS]* 67
Official's Corruption, Greed Criticized *[Radio Rossii]* 67
MVD Official Cited on Organized Crime *[Moscow TV]* 68
High Kolkhoz Prices Show 'Mafia in Full Control' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Jul]* 68
Explosion Damages Gryazovets-Moscow Gas Pipeline *[TASS]* 69
TASS Reviews 16 Jul Soviet Press 69

Economic

Yavlinskiy Interviewed on Economic Crisis *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 15 Jul]* 69
Gosbank Chairman on Centralized Bank Controls *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jul]* 71
Coal Ministry, Miners Sign Agreement *[Moscow International]* 72
Metal Workers Union Calls for 'United Actions' *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Jul]* 72
Oil Fetches High Prices at Tyumen Auction *[IZVESTIYA 10 Jul]* 72
Tank Car Plant Halted by Supply Shortages *[Moscow TV]* 73

Agricultural

Official Comments on Harvest Prospects *[Moscow TV]* 73
Cabinet Incentives to Grain Producers Welcomed *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jul]* 74
Kyrgyz Harvest Prospects Said 'Very Poor' *[Moscow TV]* 74
Grain Yield Expected To Drop 16-17 Percent *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 74
Fire Poses Threat to Nikolayev Oblast Harvest *[Moscow TV]* 75
Military Allocates 30,000 Vehicles for Harvest *[Radio Rossii]* 75
    Army Short of Drivers *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Jul]* 76

BALTIC REPUBLICS

Yavlinskiy Meets With Republic Leaders *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Jul]* 77

Estonia

Ruutel Receives FRG Group, Departs For U.S. *[Tallinn Radio]* 77
Minister Details Results of Siberian Tour *[Tallinn Radio]* 77
Ministers Comment on Shcherbakov Statement *[BALTFAX]* 78
Mayor Discusses Local Military Defense Plans *[Tallinn Radio]* 78
Hard Currency Auction Breaks Records *[Tallinn Radio]* 79
Bank Head Warns of Approaching Financial Crisis *[BALTFAX]* 79

Latvia

- Party Resolution Hits Democratic Reforms Movement *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Jul]* ... 79
- Banks Seen as Riga OMON's Next Target *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 12 Jul]* ... 80
- Official Interviewed on OMON Activities *[BALTFAX]* ... 80

Lithuania

- Landsbergis Asks Gorbachev To Withdraw Militia *[Radio Vilnius]* ... 81
  - More Details of Request Cited *[TASS]* ... 81
- Signatures Being Collected in Support of OMON *[BALTFAX]* ... 82
- Workers Hold 'Protest Shift' 15 Jul *[BALTFAX]* ... 82

RSFSR

- 16 Jul Congress of People's Deputies Proceedings ... 83
  - Supreme Soviet Candidates Stalemate Again *[TASS]* ... 83
  - Conciliation Body Formed *[TASS]* ... 83
- 15 Jul Congress of People's Deputies Proceedings *[Moscow Russian TV]* ... 83
  - Third Candidate in Congress Vote Noted *[Moscow Radio]* ... 85
  - Attempt Under Way To End Impasse *[TASS]* ... 85
- Agriculture Minister Addresses Congress 12 Jul *[Moscow Russian TV]* ... 85
  - Answers Deputies Questions *[Moscow Russian TV]* ... 87
- 'Unauthorized' Guard Established at Leningrad TV *[Radio Rossii]* ... 88
- Russians Polled on Attitudes to Parliament *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Jul]* ... 89
- Communists for Democracy Plan New Party *[TASS]* ... 89
- New Tatar President Shaymiyev Interviewed *[PRAVDA 4 Jul]* ... 90
- Communists Want Resignation of CPSU Apparatus *[ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA 12 Jul]* ... 92
- Leaders Accused of Ignoring Chernobyl Aftermath *[Moscow Radio]* ... 92
- Ryzhkov Discusses Failed Presidency Bid *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Jul]* ... 92

WESTERN REPUBLICS

Belorussia

- Trade Agreement With Bulgaria Signed *[Minsk Radio]* ... 93

Ukraine

- Kravchuk Consults With City Soviet Deputies *[Radio Kiev]* ... 93
  - Comments on Draft Union Treaty *[INTERFAX]* ... 93
- Zlenko on Relations With Hungary, Center *[Radio Kiev]* ... 93
- Defense Minister Receives Polish Delegation *[Radio Kiev]* ... 94

Moldova

- Alternative Service Law Adopted *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jul]* ... 94
- Moldovan CP Program Released *[TASS]* ... 94
- Moldovan News Agency Director Resigns *[TASS]* ... 95

CAUCASUS

Georgia

- 'Unprecedented Decline' in Production Volume *[TASS]* ... 96
- Theft of Party Property Highlighted at Plenum *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jul]* ... 96
- Results of Elections to Adzhar Supreme Soviet *[TASS]* ... 96

Armenia

- Plan Approved To Negotiate With Azerbaijan *[Moscow TV]* ... 96
- Interior Ministry Reports Casualties in NKAO *[Moscow Russian TV]* ... 97

Azerbaijan 'Pillaging' of Property Cited *[TASS]* 97
Parliament Discusses Deportations From Azerbaijan *[Moscow Radio]* 97
Interior Minister Discusses Border Casualties *[INTERFAX]* 97
Official Views Deportations in Azerbaijan *[Moscow TV]* 98
Certification of 'Liberation Struggle' Sought *[ARMENPRES]* 98
Six Parties Favor Republican Referendum *[Yerevan International]* 98

Azerbaijan

Interior Ministry Reports Developments *[INTERFAX]* 99
Popular Front Convenes Congress *[INTERFAX]* 99

CENTRAL ASIA

Kyrgyzstan

Akayev Interviewed on Draft Union Treaty *[PRAVDA 6 Jul]* 100

Tajikistan

Democratic Party of Tajikistan Registered *[IZVESTIYA 11 Jul]* 100
Luchinskiy Comments on Reforms in Central Asia *[PRAVDA 15 Jul]* 101
Dushanbe Orders Dismantling of Nuclear Reactor *[TASS]* 102

Turkmenistan

President Niyazov Discusses Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* 102
    Views Italy Visit, Foreign Ties *[TASS]* 102
    Comments on Union Treaty *[PRAVDA 8 Jul]* 102

Uzbekistan

KGB Denies Contacts With Muslim Leader *[INTERFAX]* 103

U.S. Senate To Consider Ratification of CFE

PM1507085291 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[By unnamed PRAVDA correspondent: "Ratification Lies Ahead"]

[Text] Washington—The Treaty on the Reduction of Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, which has been on the shelf since November of last year, has been submitted for consideration by the U.S. Senate for ratification. The administration, as is well known, refused to begin the ratification process because of differences with the USSR over the interpretation of a number of articles of this agreement, which was signed in Paris by 22 states.

President Bush was not exaggerating when, in his accompanying message to the Senate, he described it as the most ambitious arms control agreement ever concluded. Calling on the legislators to come to an early and favorable decision, the President noted in his message: "The Treaty is the first conventional arms control agreement since World War II. It marks the first time in history that European nations, together with the United States and Canada, have agreed to reduce and numerically limit their land-based arms, especially the offensive type. Significantly, the reductions will eliminate the overwhelming Soviet numerical advantage in conventional armaments that has existed in Europe for more than 40 years. The Treaty's limits enhance stability by ending force disparities. They limit the capability for launching surprise attacks and initiating large-scale offensive action in Europe."

Bush particularly highlights the fact that tne Treaty "will be of major importance in laying the indispensable foundation for the post-Cold War security architecture in Europe." "Only with this foundation in place," G. Bush's message says, "can we move from a European security order based on confrontation to one based on cooperation."

The difficulties in drafting the accord and the volume of work done are obvious. After all, it covers more than 20 countries and tens of thousands of items of arms deployed on a territory from the Atlantic to the Urals. It was necessary to agree on weapons classifications, counting rules, methods of destroying equipment subject to reduction, and verification and monitoring rules. Really titanic labor was invested.

Under the provisions of the agreement, NATO and the countries of the voluntarily disbanded Warsaw Pact are to reduce their conventional arms to identical levels: 20,000 tanks, 30,000 armed vehicles, 20,000 artillery pieces, 2,000 combat helicopters, and 6,800 combat aircraft. We will have to cut more weapons than others. But we had many times more. Parity is parity...

The Treaty will be approved if two-thirds of the senators vote for it.

Bush Letter Urges CFE Treaty's Ratification

PM1207155191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 91 Union Edition p 5

[By A. Blinov: "Preparing to Ratify Treaty"]

[Text] Washington—U.S. President G. Bush submitted the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe to the Senate for ratification last Tuesday [9 July].

In a letter accompanying the text of the treaty, the head of the U.S. Administration noted that the first conventional arms reduction agreement in Europe since World War II, signed by 22 NATO and former Warsaw Pact countries, is the "widest-ranging" arms control accord. The treaty "prescribes unprecedented arms reductions, strengthening the security of the United States, Canada, and the countries of Europe."

"This is the first time that the countries of Europe have, in conjunction with the United States and Canada, agreed to cut back and limit the numerical strength of their ground-based conventional arms, particularly the hardware needed to conduct offensive operations," the U.S. President noted. "The numerical limits set by the treaty strengthen stability by removing the imbalance of forces and restrict opportunities for a surprise attack and wide-ranging offensive operations in Europe."

The letter points out that the treaty makes provision not only for radical cuts in the quantity of arms and military hardware belonging to NATO and former Warsaw Pact countries, but also for a carefully elaborated system to monitor its fulfillment, exchange of data on the command structure of each country's armed forces, and the deployment of its arms and military hardware subject to the limitations.

"The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe," the U.S. President's letter says, "is an important element in creating the foundation of the architecture of European security following the end of the 'cold war.' Only after this foundation has been created will we be able to move away from confrontation to cooperation as the foundation of European security and order."

Stressing that the treaty deserves "speedy, favorable examination," the U.S. President in traditional legalese asked the Senate to "advise and consent" to its ratification. Under the U.S. Constitution, the ratification of international agreements comprises two acts: Senate approval of the treaty followed by the President's signature to the act of ratification

According to reports from U.S. Senate circles, the Senate will begin the process of examining the treaty next Thursday with hearings at the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—Secretary of State J. Baker is to testify before the committee. The U.S. press reports that a group of members of the Senate committee recently sent a letter to President G. Bush assuring him of their readiness to hold the hearings within a compressed period and complete their recommendations to the Senate regarding ratification of the treaty by the end of this month.

U.S. observers noted that the letter was signed not only by Committee Chairman C. Pell, but also by leading Republican J. Helms, who is usually critical of arms control agreements. The Senate Armed Services and Intelligence Committees will hold hearings on the treaty in September. The treaty will be examined by the full Senate once these have ended.

Chemical Weapons Destruction Program Not Endorsed

LD1007155591 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1200 GMT 10 Jul 91

[Excerpts] [Announcer Natalya Trifonova] About a year ago the U.S. and USSR presidents signed an accord on reducing the production of chemical weapons and destroying most of the stockpiles of such weapons in the United States and the USSR. In December 1990, by a decree of the USSR Council of Ministers, a decision was made to develop a program for destroying chemical weapons. Parliamentary hearings of the draft program were conducted by the Committee for the Issues of Ecology and Expedient Use of Natural Resources of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I am talking now to (Aleksey Yastrebov), representative of the above committee, a USSR people's deputy. [passage omitted] For the time being the program has not been adopted, correct?

[Yastrebov] Yes, unfortunately, the program has not been endorsed, draft legislative acts have not been submitted either to the Supreme Soviet or to the country's president. Besides, not a single one of the new working structures, neither a commission for selecting sites, not a committee or any other structure which could head, as the executive body, the entire work for preparing and implementing the state program for eliminating chemical weapons has been set up. The implementation of this program will make it possible to solve issues which are topical for our country. [passage omitted]

U.S. Team Inspects Kazakhstan Munitions Factory

LD1507142791 Moscow TASS in English 1414 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By Olga Babiy]

[Text] Petropavlovsk July 15 (TASS)—A group of American experts led by Captain Thomas Andersson departed for Moscow today from Petropavlovsk, a regional centre in Kazakhstan, where a munitions factory is situated. The group has carried out another inspection under the Soviet-American treaty on the destruction of intermediate- and shorter-range missiles.

Under the treaty, the group of eight inspectors was equipped with visual, radio-measuring and other control instruments, had the right to move without any restrictions around the region and had access to any military or civil installation.

During the inspection, an expert of the group purchased a bicycle for his son, the production of which was started by the factory in line with its conversion plans. "It's a good bike made at the level of world standards," Americans told factory representatives.

"The production of mechanisms which will help Mankind preserve the Earth's ecology for posterity, conforms most of all to the tasks of conversion," Andersson said. He stressed that, judging by the results of the inspection, the Soviet Union consistently observes the treaty's provisions.

The group has not run into any obstacles during its inspection in Kazakhstan, he added. They did not detect production or stockpiling of missiles.

U.S. Satisfied With Kiev Monitoring Visit

PM1207125791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[By UKRINFORM-TASS Correspondent N. Zaika report: "Satisfied with Results of Monitoring"]

[Text] A group of U.S. representatives has arrived in the Kiev Military District to evaluate information on military forces. This visit is the first step toward the practical implementation of the 1990 Vienna document on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe, which went into effect 1 July this year. The U.S. military specialists spent 12 hours checking the presence of combat hardware and armaments at the 110th Guards Motorized Rifle Regiment, which is commanded by the hero of the Soviet Union Guards Lieutenant Colonel I. Ploskonos.

As Colonel V. Istomin, chief of the department for ensuring the implementation of the treaty on the reduction of the district's armaments, told the UKRINFORM-TASS correspondent, the U.S. side was satisfied with the results of the monitoring.

Gorbachev Talks With G-7 in London Previewed

Ignatenko, Shcherbakov Comment

LD1507163191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1319 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] London, 15 Jul (TASS)—"A historic event within the framework of the development of relations between the USSR and the industrially developed countries of the West." This is how Vitaliy Ignatenko, head of the president's press service, referred to the forthcoming talks between President Mikhail Gorbachev and the leaders of the G-7 Western powers.

Speaking today at a news conference which took place here, he expressed some surprise about reports in today's British newspapers, a number of which gave a pessimistic view of the prospects for establishing close interaction between the USSR and the West, on the grounds that the documents prepared by the Soviet side for the meeting, allegedly "do not go far enough" along the path of reform. "All the G-7 documents are secret, Vitaliy Ignatenko said, and do not think I am much mistaken if I say that the esteemed colleagues from the British mass media have not read them. Frankly speaking, I am not familiar with them, either. The situation is rather strange: The press is commenting on the documents with which it is unfamiliar. Of course, it would be naive to suppose that Mikhail Gorbachev will leave London, loaded with money, he pointed out. This is not the purpose of the forthcoming visit. We consider the meetings with the leaders of G-7 to be not the end, but the beginning of a very long process."

Answering one of the questions, the head of the president's press service stressed that making the Soviet economy healthy is in the interest of all countries. "If conditions are created which help the USSR to join the ranks of the developed industrial powers, the states in eastern and western Europe, as well as developing countries, will only benefit from this."

Answering the question on whether the USSR is intending to stop giving economic aid to Cuba, Vitaliy Ignatenko said that, over recent years, the USSR has changed its attitude to the conditions which have developed in Cuba. "We do not support the anti-American undertakings by their authorities, but we consider it inadmissible to put discontinuance of aid to any country as a condition," he pointed out.

Regarding the situation in Iraq he pointed out that the USSR favors using all means, except military means, to influence the Iraqi Government to fulfill the UN resolutions.

Vladimir Shcherbakov, USSR first deputy prime minister and economics minister, who took part in the new conference noted that one of the government's most important criteria in formulating its economic policy is how useful the proposed reforms and measures are to people. "We take as our starting point the simple principle: Everything that is of use to people must be used, he said; if a market economy is more effective in satisfying people's requirements it must be brought in." He rejected assertions that the Soviet Government is dragging its feet over reforms and is not being sufficiently energetic and decisive in its approach to reforms. "It would be naive to suggest that a country which lived under the command and administrative system for 73 years could switch to another type of economy in an instant, he said. We are striving to ensure that the reform process is under control and does not run away with itself. There are elements of planning in any economy and they are widely in evidence in Western countries themselves. Complete rejection of the planned economy is adventurism of the first order. "If one looks at the government's program overall, he continued, one can see where we are heading: toward privatization, conversion, liberalization, the convertible ruble, free movement of people and goods throughout the country and cooperation with foreign companies. We are striving to reduce the burden of military expenditure. In the last three years it has fallen by approximately 26 percent. We are involving in effect up to 80 percent of defense enterprises in conversion. We intend to switch 400 of them to 100 percent production of peaceful produce.

In response to one of the questions, Vladimir Shcherbakov said that the government will be able to ensure ruble convertibility from internal resources, without the help of the West. However, he did admit that in such a case, there could be unforeseen complications which could doom this measure to failure as happened in Britain itself, in 1948, during the first attempt to introduce convertibility of the British pound sterling. "An additional $10-$12 million are needed for this operation to be a success," he said. "And it should be stressed that they are needed not so much for us as for foreign companies which want guarantees of the re-export of profits."

Touching on the agreement being prepared with the U.S. oil company "Chevron Oil" on the joint exploitation of Soviet oil deposits, which has attracted the attention of the Soviet press, Vladimir Shcherbakov admitted that certain aspects were omitted during preparatory work which made for claims about the unequal nature of the deal. Now, in his words, work is being done to rectify the situation.

Shcherbakov on Expectations

LD1507184891 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Unidentified correspondent] When such talks between the heads of the seven take place, then the expectations of people and the country are completely natural. What, specifically, might the country and the people expect in the near future, in tangible terms?

[Deputy Premier Shcherbakov] Well, we regard the seven not as the end of any kind of relations after which the iron curtain will suddenly be lifted, and we will receive goods and capital, and it would be naive to count on this. All the same, we regard this meeting as the beginning of a qualitatively new stage in mutual relations. For this reason, political accords should be followed by economic ones. To reckon, say, that Gorbachev will return to the Soviet Union on the 19th [of July] and that from the 20th the goods will arrive—that is naive, although many projects have already gotten under way. For example, a major cooperation project with the EC Commission, and talks have been held with Delors. Mainly we have completed our discussion on the topic of technical assistance to the value of almost $20 million, and utilization of these sums is already starting. About $250 million worth of charity goods from the EC Commission have already started to arrive. Without the meeting of the seven, I think that such movement would be practically impossible. [Video shows Shcherbakov speaking to correspondent outside a building in London]

Primakov, Sitaryan on Prospects

PM1607082791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[By A. Karpychev, T. Kolesnichenko, and A. Lyutyy under the "'Seven Plus One'—For the First Time in History" rubric: "Trial by Waiting"]

[Excerpts] London—A meeting of the leaders of the seven leading industrial countries—the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Japan, Italy, and Canada—has officially opened in the British capital. By tradition it began with a group photograph of the leaders of the seven being taken on the terrace of Lancaster House. Behind closed doors they are discussing problems of importance to their own countries and to the whole world. But it has so happened that the meeting agenda has somehow been overshadowed—it has manifestly been pushed into the background by M.S. Gorbachev's expected arrival here. [passage omitted]

As we have already reported, the USSR president familiarized his future interlocutors in advance with some of the ideas which he will present at Lancaster House. It is precisely these ideas that are at the center of attention for politicians and journalists. Some commentators treat M.S. Gorbachev's concepts with obvious approval, while others write that they are not radical enough.

Incidentally, there are many idle conjectures about M.S. Gorbachev's message, because journalists must write about something in the days before the Soviet leader's arrival. And because the chief object of interest is missing, imagination frequently prevails over facts. So how true are the assessments? We put this question to Security Council Member Ye. Primakov.

"From my contacts with the leaders of the seven themselves and their representatives," he said, "I can already draw this conclusion today: It is possible to say that M.S. Gorbachev's message has been perceived very seriously. There are various comments in the press, but it can be seen from them that the message is most frequently commented on without knowing its essence. I think that this is a kind of elementary gesture to sensationalism, but this gesture is not characteristic of serious commentators. They rightly emphasize that the very fact that the leaders of the seven are meeting with our president indicates that we have approached in real earnest a new stage in the development of relations between the USSR and the West."

Academician S. Sitaryan develops this thought in its economic aspect:

"The significance of the London dialogue can hardly be overestimated. A new concept of a unified world economic space is, in fact, emerging. For hitherto we spoke of the world economy, but the economy of one-sixth of the world's territory was absent from it. The world economy cannot exist without this part. Therefore, what is now being laid down is needed by us, by the West, and by all mankind for the 21st century...."

Since the conversation had turned to the Soviet economy's integration in the world economy, an article in THE OBSERVER struck us as interesting. It reports the plans of the seven to set up a so-called Soviet Secretariat—a permanent body consisting of experts of the IMF, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the OECD, which would systematize the setting up of economic ties between the USSR and the West and exercise political control over this process, devoting paramount attention to assistance in spheres such as privatization and the restructuring of ownership relations. The idea is not bad: The synchronization of the Soviet reforms with Western assistance demands the constant attention of professionals and politicians. You cannot get far here on the enthusiasm of individuals. [Passage omitted]

Zaraelyan: World's Future Dependent on Talks

LD1507150291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By A. Zaraelyan from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Immediately after the G-7 conference, the USSR president will meet summit participants. He has already sent them his substantial plan of action, 23 pages worth, for pulling the Soviet Union out of crisis. In principle, all members of the seven favor aid, because the lamentable state in which this superpower now finds itself is too dangerous for the whole world.

But there are points on which the various sides differ. While Germany is entirely and totally in favor, and America largely supports the idea, Bush has even suggested making the USSR an associate member of the IMF. Japanese leaders are far more restrained in their view. Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama has described the Soviet plan as too convenient for Moscow and voiced doubts about whether the members of the seven will agree to pump vast sums into the bottomless Soviet barrel.

Meanwhile, they are calling on us to make a decisive turn toward the market economy, cut back on military spending, correct the state finance deficit, and disclose our economic statistics, including our gold reserves. In return, they promise most-favored-nation status for trade and tariff discounts for our exports. This applies to the countries of the former socialist camp.

If that is the point of view which prevails in London, this will signify a change of priorities in Western policy, from direct financial aid to indirect support. This, incidentally, could prove much more effective, provided Soviet leaders really want reforms.

For the moment, we are only fighting for these, as we are for many other things. Meanwhile, life in the country of the soviets becomes worse and worse. The West sees full well the instability of this situation, the absence of guarantees, and the seething of political passions. So it will be an extremely difficult business for the members of the seven to make their decision in the coming week. Yet it is essential they do make a decision, because nothing less than the future of the world hangs on that decision.

Bovin: 'Difficult' 'Success' for Gorbachev

PM1507155591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Jul 91 Union Edition p 5

[Aleksandr Bovin "Political Observer's Opinion": "Dialogue with the 'G-7'"]

[Text] Is it possible for the Soviet Union to overcome the chaos and confusion brought about by the radical restructuring of the entire social organism single-handed, "relying on its own resources?" In principle, I believe, yes, it is. But it will take a long time, and it will cost dearly.

The alternative is to turn for financial and economic assistance to our former "opponents," the United States, Western Europe, and Japan. These states have their own interests. And, when adopting specific decisions, they will be guided primarily by their own interests rather than our needs. And they will put pressure on us, albeit subtle pressure, albeit pressure applied with the highest degree of tact, in order to steer us in a direction which suits them. This will spawn a number of moral and political difficulties.

However, our state interests make it imperative to reduce the torturous transitional period to a minimum, even if it means being pushed around a little.

These are the thoughts which come to mind on the eve of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the British capital where he will arrive not as a full-fledged member of the G-7, as an entity transforming the G-7 into a G-8, but as an honored guest.

Meetings are scheduled with each of the seven leaders individually, and with all of them together. It is obvious that our president will brief his colleagues on the plan to overcome the crisis situation and the program to stabilize the economy and its fundamental orientation toward market relations. In reply he will hear assurances of unfading respect, and friendly advice and recommendations.

Press and television appraisals will differ widely. Many will hail and back "Gorbachev's breakthrough" in coming to London. Many will try to wound him ("the man with begging bowl"), and wound Russia ("the great beggar-woman").

Undoubtedly, the fact that the G-7 has, so-to-speak, lost its innocence by inviting the man from the other side, the man who shattered tranquillity and overturned many orthodox views, is also likely to attract divergent assessments and appraisals.

The first conference of the leaders of leading capitalist powers (the same ones minus Canada) was held in November 1975 at Rambouillet, near Paris. A very serious economic crisis had produced panic. There was talk of the "great depression" of the early thirties. There were articles about an "intolerable scandal," "economic infarction," and "crushed hopes." The world is unhappy. President Giscard d'Estaing of France declared, "it is unhappy because it does not know where it is going. But if it knew this, it would find that it is heading for a catastrophe." In order to survive, it is necessary to act jointly. This was Giscard d'Estaing's conclusion, and it was met with support. The declaration adopted at Rambouillet states: "...we have held an in-depth and positive exchange of opinions on the economic situation in the world, on economic problems common to our countries, their consequences in human, social, and political terms, and the action programs needed to resolve these problems."

And so the exchange of experience and the action program laid the foundation.

I do not believe that the Rambouillet meeting appreciably accelerated capitalism's exit from the crisis. There were other mechanisms at play. Nonetheless, the idea took root. Annual conferences of the G-7 have continued to take place with enviable regularity. To begin with the G-7 concentrated mainly on economic problems, and gradually agreement and coordination not only of economic but also political strategy began to occupy more and more space on the agenda. Especially as regards East-West relations, and relations with the USSR.

The press (including the Western press), was not favorably disposed toward the G-7. Virtually after every session commentators and observers wrote about "another fiasco," "empty promises," "futile hopes," and so on and so forth. All this was true, of course. There were both empty promises and futile hopes. Concrete problems yielded with difficulty, if at all, to concrete decisions. However, to confine ourselves to stating this would mean to remain on the surface of events.

The G-7 conferences—viewed in their broad historical context—came into being as a symptom, as a sign of persistent attempts on the part of the Western world's elite to improve and stabilize the world economy, to find a way out of the common economic (and sociopolitical) difficulties in the process of establishing an international mechanism to regulate economic activity. "Confidentially," J. Reston, the well-known U.S. observer, wrote in 1977 in connection with the latest G-7 meeting, "the leaders of the seven major industrial countries admit that in order to achieve their objective—the establishment of a reliable world economic order—they must move on from talk about "consultations" and "harmonization" of their common interests to a "collective adoption of decisions," which challenges the very doctrine of states established on a national basis." Reston may be putting it too bluntly, but in my opinion his train of thought fully corresponds to the objective course of affairs.

The "great depression" demonstrated that the "self-regulation" of the capitalist economy is a matter of the past. The spontaneous development of the market proved dangerous, and it was placed under state control. After World War II effective anticrisis regulation mechanisms were established in many countries ensuring a more or less smooth economic growth and toning down of social antagonisms. The 1974-1975 crisis prompted the next step—an attempt to keep the spontaneous development of international economic ties within bounds and to place the process of the growing interdependence of the national economies on an organized and regulated footing. Not even the powerful neoconservative wave, the broad attack on the extremes of "dirigism" was able to thwart this. The G-7 survived.

The conceptual base of the G-7—management of the interdependence characteristic of the international economic order—is constantly drawing on such powerful intellectual sources as the "Bilderberg Club" and the "Trilateral Commission"—which are brain trusts of world capitalism, as it were. "As the economies of major states become increasingly interdependent, stepped up coordination becomes increasingly necessary. In addition to managing interstate economic ties, economic officials, at least major countries' officials, 'must think in terms of managing a single world economy,'" one of the commission's reports noted. However, for officials to learn to think in this way, the leaders of "the major countries at least" must have mastered this art. And each session of the G-7 adds another grain of experience to the management of interstate contradictions and the elaboration of joint approaches to common problems.

History is too paradoxical, too ironic. Probably even Nostradamus himself, had he been in Rambouillet in 1975, could not have foretold that less than two decades later the Western leaders would have to attend to the crisis of world socialism. Or, if you like, save capitalism from the crisis of socialism. Any uncertainty is frightening. For the time being it is far from clear how this crisis will end, how the perestroyka chaos will affect the "international economic order." It is also unclear—and this is of major importance—what constitutes the optimum, most advantageous measure of support for Gorbachev as far as the West is concerned.

In the U.S. Congress, for example, voices have been heard declaring that if assistance is necessary, it should be given directly to republics rather than the central Government of the Soviet Union. Because, the congressmen argue, the central government may use U.S. assistance to shore up "expiring Marxism." Incidentaly, the events in Yugoslavia have increased the number of supporters of this approach. Ultimately it will not be they, of course, who decide what goes. This will be decided by pragmatically-minded politicians who believe that it is necessary and advantageous for the West to support Gorbachev, and ultimately to facilitate the USSR's integration into the world economy. But they also believe that firm and precise terms for this must be laid down, so as to "steer the Soviet Union in the right direction"—as R. Gephardt, leader of the Democratic Majority in the U.S. Congress House of Representatives, put it.

The content and nature of the terms in question can be judged more thoroughly on the basis of an article by Z. Brzezinski, published in THE WASHINGTON POST. Our strategic objective, Brzezinski points out, is not to reform but to transform the Soviet Union. To transform the economy means to privatize it (here, according to Brzezinski, lies the key to radically changing the system), democratize the political regime, and to achieve self-determination of the republics, and demilitarization of the state.

At first glance it may seem that Brzezinski is going too far, that he is setting the bar so high that Gorbachev has no chance of clearing it, and will not even attempt to. But let's give it some thought and go over it again: privatization, democratization, self-determination, and demilitarization. After all, we ourselves have already embarked on this road, and are advancing along it, albeit stumbling, but advancing. Most probably our Western partners' understanding of the aforementioned concepts differs somewhat from ours (with all the reservations as regards pluralism). But wherever it is question of degree or measure rather than principles, it is always possible to reach agreement, to find a compromise.

Debate is inevitable. However, something else is important. The range of problems which are understood in more or less the same way in our country and in the West is growing. The basis for constructive cooperation is strengthening accordingly.

Sometimes the situation is presented as a kind of vicious circle. On the one hand, in order to restructure our economy, we need the West's assistance, on the other hand no assistance will help us before we have restructured our "economy." Fortunately such "vicious" circles exist only in theory. Practice "lifts the spell," it breaks the circle by operating simultaneously from both directions.

But let us return to London.

It will be difficult for Gorbachev.

The friendly hosts will smile. But as stated earlier, it will not be their smiles but their interests and political calculations which will determine their positions. They feel they are the conquerors, and they will, no doubt, let Gorbachev know this.

The guest will also smile, despite the fact that he will have to play a game without trumps. Despite the fact that the country behind him is not solid and uniform but argumentative and quarrelsome. And despite the fact that most of the possible options have a bitter flavor.

Money, as far as I can "foresee" will not be forthcoming. And if it is, then, as THE SUNDAY TELEGRAPH put it, it will be a matter of only "a few kopeks." In any event, the question of terms concerning loans, investments, economic cooperation, and our country's integration into the world economy will be raised sharply.

So what is the upshot?

There are situations in which it is easy to be skeptical, and even easier to be pessimistic. Nonetheless I will say that it is necessary to go to London. No matter how the London vigil ends, no matter how complex and even ambiguous Gorbachev's position and his stay in London may be, it has to be viewed as a success of both, his personal diplomacy and a success of Soviet foreign policy. And this success does not lie in having managed to pry open the door to the world economy. We have a long way to go for that. But in the fact that people continue to reckon with us as an important factor in international politics.

'No Miracle' Expected

PM1507152391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 p 3

[Interview with A.P. Vladislavlev, vice president of the USSR Scientific and Industrial Union, by correspondent S. Razin; date, place not given; first paragraph is KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA introduction: "Expect No Miracle from 'the Seven'"]

[Text] The G-7 will meet in London in a few days' time. One of the most intriguing questions at this meeting is the rendering of assistance to the Soviet Union. What is the USSR president taking with him to Britain? And what will he return with? A.P. Vladislavlev, vice president of the USSR Scientific and Industrial Union, answers our correspondent's questions.

[Razin] Aleksandr Pavlovich, I do not know about you, but my soul is troubled. It seems that the G-7 is our last chance.... What are your forecasts for the results of the London meeting?

[Vladislavlev] My forecast is this: M. Gorbachev's trip to London marks the start of a great and earnest dialogue. The whole world wants to cooperate actively with our country. Western business is ready to invest big capital in our huge, unplowed market. Such natural resources, such intellectual potential, such culture....

In short, all that is now happening in our country is of global significance.

[Razin] That is, your forecast for the London meeting is optimistic?

[Vladislavlev] But what do you have in mind? The easy money which Gorbachev supposedly intends to ask for in London?

Let us make realistic forecasts: No one will give colossal loans and credits just like that. And incidentally, there is no need for this. Over the past 20-30 years we have squandered so many petrodollars that we could have worked an economic miracle some five times over. Financial aid from the G-7 can only be counted on if Yavlinskiy's concept is reinforced by a specific program. If we want currency injections to revive our economy, we must have a package of investment programs—starting with the base sectors and ending with high technologies. The West is ready to make such an expenditure.

I would like to emphasize once again that the London meeting is a political action. Everything depends on whether Gorbachev is able to convince the leaders of "the seven" that the main destabilizing factors in our country are already behind us and that the country is emerging onto the road of reforms, albeit agonizingly and with difficulty. If he can convince them, cooperation with the West will begin. If not, we will have to extricate ourselves from the crisis on our own.

[Razin] Unpredictability, by all accounts, is the chief feature of our power. An opportunity for concord among us seemed to have emerged in April. But suddenly, like a bolt from the blue, there was the parliamentary demarche of Premier V. Pavlov and a new round of the war of laws.

To all appearances, the Cabinet of Ministers is becoming the chief destabilizing factor. The center-republic's problem still remains open.

[Vladislavlev] I disagree with much that the Union Government is doing. But I would not call the premier the main boulder in the road. Alas, the economy is in such a perilous state today that tough, unpopular actions are inevitable. I have known Valentin Sergeyevich a long time: He is a strong economist and a strong-willed and vigorous person, and he must tackle economic problems and the economy above all, but he has clearly gotten carried away with politics. But politician Pavlov is not comparable to economist Pavlov. We cannot wander in the desert for 40 years, like Moses, and wait for a new generation of leaders. This is a colossal problem: We cannot cut at a stroke the entire stratum of ministers, their deputies, and directors. We will have to walk to the promised lands with the people we have.

[Razin] It is possible to approach this problem from the other side. M. Gorbachev declared recently that he approved of the Scientific and Industrial Union's proposals to set up a council of entrepreneurs under the USSR president. If you consider that almost all the independent economic structures intend to join this council, and the Scientific and Industrial Union itself has influence over 65-70 percent of the state sector, then you get the impression that all the conditions are consciously being created for Premier V. Pavlov to be able to exclusively tackle problems of stabilizing the economy, do you not?

[Vladislavlev] What is surprising about that? Japan worked according to this model during the postwar years. Relying on the traditional structures of management, the government resolved current, urgent problems, for instance bread and butter are needed every day. But the development and deepening of the market and enterprise must be tackled by a special organ set up under the president and removed from subordination to the Cabinet of Ministers. Such "dual propulsion" in the economy will, I believe, facilitate the country's emergence from the crisis and make public concord more stable.

[Razin] What do the directors of state enterprises think about this?

[Vladislavlev] Some do not even want to hear of enterprise, others are rushing in full sail toward the market. But the crux of the problem is not who the economic planners favor—Pavlov or Yeltsin. Hitherto two extremes, two oppositions, have held sway in the country. On the one hand the orthodox people entrenched in the CPSU, and on the other hand, the rally-radicals bearing no less dangerous destruction. But a third force is needed now—a broad sociopolitical movement with a clear and constructive program in support of radical reforms. The lack of this force has been our chief misfortune. I hope that we will now be able to fill this gap.

'Blank Check' Not Expected

PM1607090991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[By A. Lyutyy: "Behind the Doors of the Music Room. London on the Eve of the Meeting of 'The Seven'"]

[Excerpts] An interesting fact: The room in which our president will sit at a "round table" with the leaders of the seven leading industrially developed countries at approximately 1430 on 17 July is called the Music Room. It is claimed that the great Chopin himself once played the piano there for Britain's Queen Victoria. But now the music of big-league politics will be heard here. How will it turn out—harmonious or not very harmonious? We shall see what we shall see. [passage omitted]

Of course, the Western leaders cannot afford just to yield to expectations. Over the past few weeks the seven have been trying to formulate a common approach to the problem of giving assistance to the USSR. A difference of opinions has so far been in evidence. As THE WASHINGTON POST remarked, those countries which are geographically furthest from the USSR take the coolest attitude of all to the granting of financial aid to Moscow. They can bide their time, as the saying goes.

For example, France, Italy, and, in particular, the FRG, which are quite close to our sick economic home, advocate financial injections for the Soviet economy. True, in those spheres where a real return can be expected from such injections, Britain, the United States, and, to a lesser degree, Canada are against granting money, for they believe that the USSR has not been prepared to use it efficiently. But at the same time these countries advocate expert technical assistance, measures to support the switch to ruble convertibility, and the USSR's gradual involvement in the activities of the IMF and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. In principle, they also take a positive attitude to the idea of targeted funding of our large-scale projects whereby money is allocated to a specific program with the participation and control of Western specialists. A stocktaking of positions was carried out at the recent conference of finance ministers and central bank managers of the seven in London. All agreed, for example, that the heads of state and government should be recommended to assent to USSR associate membership to the IMF. This will mean expert assistance for the Soviet Union in reforming the budget mechanism, training specialists, conducting research in various spheres of the economy, and drawing up programs for their modernization. Full membership of this body is not ruled out in the future.

In any case, the INTERNATIONAL HERALD TRIBUNE writes, the seven are currently preparing "a package of specific projects to assist the USSR in restoring the production of energy sources and in restructuring the system of food storage and distribution."

Soon after meeting with G. Yavlinskiy, British Chancellor of the Exchequer Norman Lamont unambiguously declared: "Massive financial aid is not the answer to the Soviet Union's problems." According to him, what the USSR needs, above all, is efficient privatization, price liberalization, the creation of most-favored-nation status for enterprise, and other structural reforms.

British commentators believe that the West cannot let the Soviet leader go away from London with good parting wishes but with empty hands. But at the same time they are proposing that we clearly determine just where we ourselves want to go.

In other words, even if the ensemble of "voices" sounds really pleasant in the Music Room, they will hardly write us a blank check. We will mainly have to extricate ourselves from the economic quagmire on our own. The West can only suggest how best to do this.

Shcherbakov Seeks Western Energy Investments

LD1607084391 Paris France-Inter Radio Network in French 0600 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Shcherbakov has made it clear to reporter Ulysse Gosset that his country does not expect Western subsidies, but Western investments instead.

[Begin Recording] [Shcherbakov in Russian with superimposed French translation] First, I think that the West must understand that one can only do away with this business wall which exists between the West and the Soviet Union by joint efforts. Second, what we want is political support from the West, because it would be good for both sides to develop mutually advantageous relations. We want the London summit to be the beginning of cooperation, not the end.

[Gosset] One fundamental criticism by the West is that the plan is not specific enough. One is afraid of sinking billions into the Soviet economy. What do you say to this?

[Shcherbakov] As to reassuring public opinion about the Soviet economy swallowing up this money, we are not asking for loans from the governments of Western countries, we are merely asking for investments in the fields of energy, above all, cooperation in matters regarding ecology, the Green movement. This should prove to be mutually advantageous. [end recording]

TASS Interviews UK's Hogg on G-7, Iraq

LD1207205891 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Quotation marks as received]

[Text] London July 7 TASS—Follows the full text of the interview by Britain's Minister of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs Douglas Hogg to TASS Director General Lev Spiridonov:

"Q: Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has been invited to London to meet heads of state and government of the Big Seven and this meeting promises to be historic simply because it is unprecedented in the history of East-West relations. Britain played a major role in this decision. What does the British Government expect from this meeting and do G7 partners differ in their approaches to the forthcoming talks?

A: We are very much looking forward to President Gorbachev's visit to Britain and particularly his meeting with the economic summit heads. This will indeed be a historic occasion. We - and I am sure all our G7 partners - very much hope that it will mark the beginning of a new process of cooperation and dialogue between us. It is clear that the summit will not be considering financial assistance. But I expect summit heads will want to consider with President Gorbachev practical ways in which they can cooperate, drawing on all relevant sources of bilateral and multilateral sources of expertise to support reform and to help integrate the Soviet Union into the world economy.

Q: Britain has maintained a special stance towards European integration, which differs largely from that of the majority of its EC partners. Why is this and how does Britain envision 21st-century Europe?

A: The UK's approach is no different from that of our partners. We want to work together in the community on things we can do better in common than individually. The community is founded on two principles. First, it is voluntary: countries belong because they want to. Secondly, it is democratic and therefore develops by agreement between all the member states and their people. This is why it has proved both stable and prosperous. These two principles will allow it to enlarge and develop into the 21st century as successful as it has grown in the first 34 years of its existence.

Q: Judging by British press reports, political circles in your country, including at the highest government level, keep a close eye on developments in the Soviet Union and eastern Europe. Representatives of Western governments, including the British cabinet, have repeatedly reiterated support for perestroika and their readiness to expand cooperation with the Soviet Union, including in the economic sphere. However, life shows that British business people, although well aware of the potential of the Soviet market, are in no hurry to "conquer it". What are the reasons and what do you think both London and Moscow should do to upgrade such cooperation?

A: The UK has long been a substantial trading partner with the USSR. The Soviet market offers enormous potential to British firms, but the underlying strength of the USSR economy suggests we could clearly do more when the economy turns round. In the shorter term there are many companies keen to do business, demonstrated by the attendance of some 200 companies at the CBI [Confederation of British Industries] Conference on 1 July about trading with the Soviet Union. However, while British companies are owed over 100 million pounds, many debts more than a year overdue, I could quite understand why some companies might regard the USSR as a risky market at present. In order to attract western investment, the USSR needs to establish a clear legal framework, pay off its arrears and restore its former impeccable payments record.

Q: People in the Soviet Union know well that Britain has played a major role in the conflict in the Gulf and the Kurdish problem. The Soviet Union also played a role in settling the conflict, although in a different way than western countries. What is your opinion of the role played by Soviet diplomacy during the conflict and what role do you assign to the Soviet Union in future efforts to settle Middle Eastern problems?

A: A key factor in the resolution of the Gulf crisis was the degree of unity shown by the international community in its determination to remove Saddam Hussein from Kuwait. As a permanent member of the Security Council, the Soviet Union played a prominent role in formulating the international response. The Soviet Union will have an equally important part to play in the resolution of other Middle East issues which are currently high on the international agenda, namely efforts to promote a solution to the Arab-Israel dispute, the follow-up to Iraq's aggression against Kuwait, particularly its weapons of mass destruction and missiles, and measures to prevent arms proliferation in the region. We look forward to working closely and effectively with the Soviet Union in these areas. We are also very grateful for the generous assistance which the Soviet Union has provided in recent months to two British nationals detained in Iraq."

Paris UNSC Talks on Arms Trade Viewed

PM1607092191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

[By Vsevolod Ovchinnikov under the "My Opinion" rubric: "To Prevent Pseudo-Conversion"]

[Text] In Paris recently the five permanent members of the UN Security Council—the USSR, the United States, Britain, France, and China—discussed the question of how to regulate the arms trade and, above all, to prevent the spread of means of mass destruction, particularly to such dangerously explosive regions as the Near East.

The bitter paradox is that the five aforementioned great powers, which bear the chief responsibility under the UN Charter for maintaining international peace, head the list of the major exporters of combat hardware. In particular, they were the chief suppliers of the weapons with which Iraq seized Kuwait last summer.

The military conflagration by the oil wells of the Persian Gulf reminded mankind that East-West detente can lead to dangerous "pseudo-conversion," i.e. the transfer of combat hardware from the North to the South whereby weapons which have become unnecessary in the European theater of military confrontation make their way to developing countries in a mighty flood.

The Paris conference was a major step toward creating a generally accepted "code of conduct" in the international arms trade. The meeting participants declared in the communique that they will not transfer conventional arms to anyone if the excessive buildup of military potentials will have a destabilizing impact. They also noted the threat to peace and stability associated with the proliferation of nuclear arms, chemical and biological weapons, and missiles and began formulating fair, reasonable, all-embracing, balanced, and specific measures to control them on both a global and a regional scale.

This concerns, above all, the creation of a zone free from weapons of mass destruction in the Near East. To realize this, it is proposed to eliminate "surface-to-surface" missiles from that area, not to produce or import components of nuclear warheads, to place all nuclear reactors under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and to oblige the states of the region to accede to the convention banning chemical weapons.

I regard as an important result of the Paris meeting the accord among the "big five" to set up under the UN secretary general's auspices a register of interstate deals to export and import combat hardware which would be drawn up on an absolutely objective basis. The Soviet Union has long been campaigning for just such glasnost in the world arms trade.

It is clear from the communique adopted in Paris that the five permanent members of the UN Security Council intend to meet again in London in order to continue this meeting in October. They declared that the transfer of weapons and military technology regardless of specific conditions promotes instability in some regions, and they acknowledged their special responsibility for measures which must eliminate such a risk.

This undoubtedly concerns means of mass destruction above all. The Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, signed in 1968 on the initiative of the USSR, the United States, and Britain, played a considerable role in curbing the arms race at its most dangerous time. More than 140 states have acceded to the treaty. This summer the Republic of South Africa was added to the list. The PRC recently declared its intention to accede to the Nonproliferation Treaty in the very near future.

As regards ballistic missiles and the technology of their production, the seven (the United States, Japan, Germany, Britain, France, Italy, and Canada) decided in 1987 to limit the sale of such weapons to other states. It is gratifying that the Soviet Union and China also became parties to the accords on this question in Paris for the first time.

Experience has shown that deliveries of conventional combat hardware can also pose a threat to international stability. It is a pity that the Soviet-U.S. talks on the arms trade were broken off at the time of the exacerbation of the "cold war" in the late seventies. PRAVDA has already written that maybe the time has now come to set up something like the Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls, but not in order to conceal from the East the scientific and technical achievements of the West but to prevent the arms race from shifting from the North to the South, from developed countries to developing ones.

The Paris meeting of the "big five" was an important landmark on the way to placing the arms trade within a sensible, secure framework while preserving every state's legitimate right to defend itself and consequently to acquire the means necessary for this, and to prevent "pseudoconversion," i.e. the shifting of military confrontation from one plane to another.

Common European Home Seen as Unsustainable

PM1107074591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 5 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[By Professor Eduard Volodin, doctor of philosophical sciences: "The Geopolitical Fantasies of Our Observer: What It Costs Us To Build the Home"]

[Text] Everyone is aware that in Europe statesmen and politicians have begun, like professional masons, to erect a common home stretching from the Atlantic to the Urals. The nobility of the aims touches the heart and uplifts the soul—you will have no borders, no customs posts, no hassles over currency. If only the introduction of Esperanto were envisaged as the means of communicating at home, it would be altogether splendid.

In the euphoria induced by universal understanding and the overwhelming firepower of the mass media there has somehow been no time to ponder the political, economic, and ethnocultural bases of the plan proposed by the political architects, and it is only with the passage of time and the start of the groundwork that you increasingly come to appreciate what starry-eyed idealism or unimagined recklessness guided those who prepared and signed this plan.

Let us start with the military-political confrontation which is being abolished by the pan-European doctrine. Whatever is said there now, until the late eighties the reality was the existence of two political systems and two structures of economic life, each of which was underpinned by a corresponding military potential which prevented either side from changing the political-economic system by means of force. However, events in Eastern Europe in the last two years have developed in such a way that all outward signs of confrontation have disappeared like a dream, like early morning mist. The CEMA and the Warsaw Pact have departed this life, which has done away with the notion of the "socialist camp." Moreover, some East European countries are already offering their services to NATO (the presence of an auxilliary military contingent made up of former socialist countries in the Persian Gulf region should be regarded as a test run) and setting up close contacts with the EEC. To the aforementioned should be added the political structural reforms which have released the communist parties from the burden of power, opened up to antisocialist forces the route to the structures of power, and untied the hands of anti-Sovietism, which is already creating tension between the USSR and the former fraternal states.

Thus what we have here is a process of disintegration which is spreading throughout the countries of East Europe in all areas. And this makes it possible to ask the following question of these deliberate builders of the all-European home: How considered and validated are the programs to create an all-European Elysium when it has been clear from the very outset that a change in the political system and economic structure in Eastern Europe would provoke a very deep crisis which itself obstructs the harmonious establishment of the all-European community? The planners cannot be regarded as short-sighted or superficial. Therefore all you can believe is that the plan itself was principally aimed at abolishing military-political confrontations at the expense of East Europe and the USSR and that the general crisis in the former "socialist camp" was regarded as a condition of the irreversibility of the process of dismantling the socialist system. Given that in West Europe itself integration continues at every level, you have to draw the conclusion that the actions taken to abolish the socialist system with precisely those envisaged consequences whereby East Europe turns into a system run by the EEC, NATO, and the multinationals have been deliberate in nature. So this is how the common European home was conceived and these are the kind of outbuildings in which it is intended to accomodate the East European countries.

The eastern border of the common European home—the Urals—warrants special attention. The geographical border between Europe and Asia is turning into a politico-economic border, and this needs to be treated with utter seriousness. Under the plan it turns out that the Soviet Union is divided in two, one part of which will reside in the common European home on the same terms as the East European countries, while the Asian part.... As regards that Asian part, what comes into play here are no longer the national interests pertinent to the peoples inhabiting the Asian part of the USSR, but the geopolitical interests of Japan and China, and it is astounding that this simple truth and long-standing design were ignored by our country's leaders.

But here is an interesting point: Even the European part of the USSR represents such might and possesses such industrial, economic, and agricultural potential that it is capable, when united, of, if not standing against, then balancing the alignment of forces in the "united" Europe. Such "parity" could not have suited the grand architects of European concord and there is nothing surprising in perestroyka in the Soviet Union itself having taken the form of the country wanting sovereignty, which right now renders the existence of the unified state problematic. If, however, you add to a sovereign Baltic, an independent Ukraine, and a who-know's-what Moldavia the plans to break the present territory of Russia up into fiefdoms, feudal lands, and free economic zones, then such a political future for the European part of the USSR and Russia becomes comparable to the reality of the East European countries and coincides in terms of its consequences with the politico-economic stagnation of the former countries of the "socialist community."

The ethnocultural problem should also be added to what has been said. Judging by what is now happening in East Europe, there can be no question of any harmonization of interethnic processes. Yugoslavia is seething with ethnic antagonisms, the Bulgarian-Turkish conflict is worsening, Romanian-Hungarian friction is on the increase, the question of Czechoslovak unity is growing increasingly acute, interdenominational conflicts have become a reality in Poland. The interethnic drama in the USSR, and specifically on its East European border, is becoming increasingly apparent too, as in the Ukraine, where interdenominational tension has already led to tragedies within a single ethnic whole. Given these conditions, the establishment of European-wide fraternity cannot be counted on unless you envisage the emergence of an extranational and suprastate repressive apparatus which will put down conflicts and establish a new order. No such apparatus is mentioned in the documents of the common European conference, but it does no harm to make provision for it in the prevailing conditions.

Only the complete atrophy of a sense of national pride and the sorry state of political thinking of the leaders of the political movements of East European countries can explain why they got themselves involved in this building work as trainees and apprentices, sacrificing their peoples to the extranational temple of the united Europe that is under construction.

The common European home is necessary, is a vital necessity, for Western Europe and the multinationals. The level of production and overproduction which existed in the mid-eighties and the distribution of raw materials and manpower in the Third World were such that all reserves were brought into operation and utilized. The capitalist system was objectively heading for a new crisis which could affect fundamental political and economic structures. The vital question of new sales markets, new sources of raw materials, and new pools of manpower was posed. The redistribution of all this solely within the capitalist system could have produced conflicts affecting the interests of the multinationals and extranational capital. That is why the West was so happy that perestroyka started in the USSR and the political processes started up in East Europe. That is why their objective need for the "socialist camp" itself has objectively performed a stabilizing role for West Europe. That is why the ideological, political, and media molding of public opinion continues to this day to demonstrate the indemonstrable benefit of perestroyka for the USSR and the whole world.

But to the same extent that the disintegration of the countries of East Europe and the USSR helps maintain the status quo in West Europe, all the crises in the former socialist camp work against the concept of a common European home. It may be assumed that the next five years will put everything in its place and that this configuration will make us consider national interests, which are manifestly not envisaged by the builders of the all-European mansion.

There are two more factors that will demolish this plan which is being put into effect. This principally concerns united Germany, which will soon feel cramped in the small all-European room it has been allocated. Germany operates in Europe on the basis of its own national interests. And it is they, rather than the European architects' plans, which will determine the economic policy and political ties of this very large and most powerful state in Europe.

The other factor is to be sought in the changing political processes in Russia. No person, nor any political forces, will manage to turn it into a patchwork quilt, and the disintegration of the USSR is still subject to considerable doubt. Russia will certainly put an end to the political shambles and national priorities and interests will be made the basis of its political doctrine. It will emerge from the crisis renewed and halt the experiment of introducing reckless innovations into Russia.

Two centers—Germany and Russia—will emerge on the expanse of Europe which will determine the fate of the continent and influence the world community. And the building of the all-European Tower of Babel will end there. Healthy processes of cooperation among the peoples and states on the basis of national policy and national interests will begin—in the name of pan-human unity.

United States & Canada

Bessmertnykh, Delegation on Talks in U.S.

Report on Talks

PM1507190591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jul 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondents A. Blinov and V. Nadein: "Success in Washington"]

[Text] Washington—Literally half an hour before the end of these talks, an official declared: failure. The delegations, CNN television news said, are parting with nothing. And that was not hard to believe. Ongoing reports from the three-day meeting were not reassuring. But then Soviet Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker came out to the journalists thronging the State Department foyer. And the word that came not from the sidelines, but from the delegation heads themselves, was: success. Or, as the secretary of state put it, "outstanding progress."

The Soviet Union and the United States have been discussing the treaty on strategic offensive arms limitation and reduction for nine years. This treaty is vast and unparalleled, as are the weapons it is designed to cut. For a year now it has appeared that only purely technical details remained. But since, in nuclear weapons, every nut and bolt implies death for millions of people, the final agreement was receding all the time, like the horizon as you approach it.

Even now the final line has not been drawn. The sides did not have quite enough time. How much more time did they need? Two hours? Two weeks? The perfidious nature of the subject is such that no one knows. But it is definitely known that, first, out of the many differences, one remains. And, second, that it is soluble.

But, as J. Baker stressed in summing up the results of the meeting, all the interim successes are important only as a way of keeping account internally of the work done. A treaty is possible only as a package of solutions. All the other accords in the 1,000-page text are worth nothing until an answer to that final problem is agreed and accepted by both sides.

However, as A.A. Bessmertnykh put it, what remains unresolved "is not even a problem, but a single aspect of a single problem."

At the end of last week, when President G. Bush put to President M.S. Gorbachev a pressing request to send a delegation with wide powers to Washington urgently, he himself assessed the treaty as "96-percent" ready. Out of all the interwoven problems, there remained on the table three hard nuts on which several expert teams had already blunted their teeth. In the jargon of the participants in the talks, they were designated as "downloading," "telemetry," and "throwweight."

This "downloading," or, to put it more accurately, "lowering of the number of countable warheads on missiles with multiple reentry vehicles," was described by A.A. Bessmertnykh, head of the Soviet delegation, as "the main task on which we were working here and which we were trying to resolve first and foremost." The task was fully resolved.

"Telemetry," or the entire range of questions relating to obtaining, deciphering, and using data from missile launches, was described by Bessmertnykh as the "press favorite." Probably because the press has rightly regarded the telemetry problem first and foremost as a touchstone, an indicator of openness. An indication of how far the sides—and first and foremost the military in the two countries—are prepared to show their hands.

After the talks, when Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff, slightly tired with success, were talking unconstrainedly with a group of Soviet journalists, the minister said:

"The talks have lasted nine years, and all that time telemetry was discussed as if it was something absolutely impossible. People thought this problem was impossible to solve. And telemetry covers a multitude of different aspects. We had to sweat over it."

The general lifted the curtain a fraction:

"Old missiles, new missiles... Telemetry from the missile, telemetry from the warhead... In the boost phase, in the free-flight phase... The Americans have been waiting for this moment for 35 years, in order to obtain at least some material about our missiles... For us too, the material we will have access to is of great interest. In short, we decided that we will exchange magnetic tapes."

In the course of the talks that have ended, the sides reached an accord of fundamental importance on the subject of what is to be considered a new missile and what is a modification not classified as a cardinal improvement of strategic weapons. After lengthy maneuvers, agreement was reached: A missile with a throwweight exceeding its predecessor's by 21 percent or more is deemed to be a new missile.

But how can these percentages be measured? The future military-strategic programs of the Soviet Union and the United States will depend on the answer to this question, A.A. Bessmertnykh said. And he went on to say: "We must be very careful and very attentive in this respect. Because lurking behind every figure and every indicator are the most complex problems of the building of the Soviet Union's strategic Armed Forces."

The chief of the General Staff stressed that in his firm conviction, the treaty "will fully ensure the security of our national borders." And since M.A. Moiseyev made a special request to journalists who participated in the conversation, we will cite his whole answer to the question of how he assesses cooperation between servicemen and civilians within our delegation.

The general said: "I want to get rid of this old issue altogether. It remains from the time of my predecessor (the present foreign minister). When accusations were being made that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is working in one key and the Ministry of Defense in another. So you must let all the readers and the general public know that there we have no differences. Let me say that today I was filled with admiration for Aleksandr Aleksandrovich's stance, both as a man and as a citizen."

The heads of the delegations embarked on their European journey late Sunday evening and not midday Saturday, as had been previously planned. J. Baker—to London, to the G-7 meeting. A.A. Bessmertnykh to Moscow, to report to the USSR president.

But the experts' work on the last "hard nut"—as it turned out—was not suspended even for a day. Furthermore, as M.A. Moiseyev said, there remained "a night, a day, and a night until M.S. Gorbachev's departure to London, which is equal to three whole days for a military man." The leaders of our delegation, as indeed the Americans, are not excluding the possiblity that by Wednesday—when the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush is scheduled to take place—it will be stated that the last difference of opinion no longer exists in the text of the unparalleled treaty.

This will remove the last of the obstacles to a Moscow meeting. However, the heads of both the Soviet and U.S. foreign policy departments stressed that the two presidents would take the definitive decision, and their London "half-meeting," as A.A. Bessmertnykh called it, would predetermine the dimensions and substance of the summit.

The Soviet minister noted that it would be impossible to overcome the last remaining problems without the sincere desire of both sides to reach accord. In his opinion, this results from a general desire on the part of the White House "within the framework of its possibilities and concepts to assist (the Soviet Union), particularly as regards the transition of our economy to a market economy."

"Aside from the treaty on strategic weapons we also have a mass of other matters," the minister said. "New Soviet-American agreements are being elaborated. There are five fully concluded agreements in the bilateral sphere. Another six are being worked on."

Examining the delegation's three days of work in the context of Soviet-U.S. relations, A.A. Bessmertnykh noted both the distinct desire on the part of the U.S. administration to conclude a treaty on strategic arms and hold a summit meeting in Moscow, and the reanimation of forces in the United States that actively oppose the deepening of Soviet-U.S. cooperation. According to General Moiseyev, it was clear "even to the unaided eye" that the White House leadership is experiencing pressure from circles that are in no hurry to conclude the said agreement and even some that do not want it to be concluded at all.

Unfortunately, A.A. Bessmertnyhk noted, "one of the reasons for the difficulties is our internal problems. Some people here want to exploit the difficulties the Soviet Union is running up against, and push it toward a catastrophe."

The presence of almost a hundred participants in each negotiating side, including many experts, led to a special tempo being established in the negotiating process, when tense discussions were interspersed with pauses. These pauses, which specialists in particular fields needed to tie up technical details, were used by the heads of the delegations to exchange opinions on a broad range of problems, of which Soviet-U.S. relations was the main—but not the only—one.

"The leadership of the administration informed us that in the next few days it will submit for approval by Congress the text of the Soviet-U.S. trade agreement. We were also given a guide as to the prospects of its passage through Congress," A.A. Bessmertnykh said.

For their part, the Americans were interested in the way we are resolving the problem of the protection of intellectual property. As is known, the trade agreement envisages talks on this subject.

On the whole it can be said that the U.S. Administration is actively inclined in this sphere. The approval of the agreement, the resolution of the question of Most Favored Nation status, and the removal of restrictions on the granting of credits would create a whole chain of favorable opportunities.

The theme of Iraq, which has not left the pages of the newspapers, was also broached in conversations between the leaders of the diplomatic departments of the Soviet Union and the United States. "There was discussion of the controversial theme of the Iraqi nuclear program," A.A. Bessmertnykh said. "And the documents presented by the Iraqi leadership itself testify to the fact that this program is of a serious nature. We have had to establish how the international community should behave in such an event. We are operating here within the Security Council framework and in accordance with the line being pursued by the UN secretary general. We are taking into consideration the work that UN inspectors are carrying out on the spot."

"The situation is after all very serious," A.A. Bessmertnykh said. "However, we must admit that Iraq did submit the required information. Now we have to eliminate the complicating factors."

The Soviet Union and the United States are the initiators of the holding of an international conference on a Near East settlement. What is the effect of the efforts being undertaken by both sides?

"We exchanged the sum total of information that has accumulated in order to find out whether any real progress has been made," A.A. Bessmertnykh said. "It is true that before this meeting we have indeed corresponded on this question and communicated by telephone. As we have noted, the efforts we have made did make for a certain progress. It may not be very noticeable but it is there. Both on the part of the Arab states, and, as Secretary of State Baker believes, on Israel's part. We recently had contacts with the Palestinians. Flexibility of approach is also becoming apparent on their part. It is important that there is some movement. At the moment it is impossible to predict when this conference will take place. We also cannot fully guarantee that nothing will wreck it, but we are moving in the right direction."

TASS Reviews Talks

LD1507112191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0923 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By correspondents Igor Barsukov, Aleksey Berezhkov, Aleksandr Korolev]

[Text] Washington, 15 July, (TASS)—I do not recall a round of talks when so much was done in such a short period of time, USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said in an interview with Soviet journalists after the completion of his talks with United States Secretary of State J. Baker on Sunday. He was summing up the results of the intensive discussions which had taken place in the American capital, aimed at completing work on the treaty on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons. The minister also gave an appraisal of the current state and prospects for Soviet-American relations.

A.A. Bessmertnykh stressed that the treaty on strategic offensive weapons was "the most phenomenal document ever drawn up in history". I am not speaking about volume. It is such a fantastically complicated penetration to the heart of strategic balances and technologies that I do not exclude that it might be the first and last treaty of such a kind, the minister said.

The main problem with which we struggled was the reduction in the number of ballistic missile warheads taken into consideration, A.A. Bessmertnykh continued. This occupied the brains of the experts in our delegations for quite a long time, and it was at last successfully and fully resolved here, taking into account mutual interests and the guaranteeing of the Soviet Union's national security. The very difficult problem, the favorite of the press, concerns telemetry, that is the encryption of technical information coming from missiles during trial launches, and it was also overcome. The cardinal problem with bombers was resolved as well. Unfortunately one of the small "sticking points" in the talks prevented us from finally reaching agreement. This was the definition of new types of missiles and, in particular, one of the aspects of the problem—the calculation of their throw-weight.

But I think we can quite justifiably say that these were successful negotiations, emphasized the minister. The discussions about the strategic offensive weapons have been going on for 9 years, and all the time we have been talking about telemetry. This problem was not solved in Geneva or in Washington, or in Moscow. And now the time has come when we had to decide. And everything came together. Each side gets absolutely identical possibilities. But I shall be frank, we did do some sweating over telemetry. This issue was terribly complex. Just as, incidentally, was the problem of reducing the number of warheads and the missile throw-weight. These are such fundamental questions which will probably also predetermine many aspects of future negotiations.

One of the sources of success of the work done, he noted, consists in the fact that we brought a strong team here. The delegation includes members of the main agencies which determine our military policy and the strategic line in military organizational development and industry. They are experts of the highest calibre. Indeed many decisions were made here on the spot, within the powers given to us by the president, which enabled us to solve in 3 days problems which had been sitting on the negotiating table for months and perhaps even years. Take the following detail of the negotiations: We have never before had creative elaborations going on like this, one wave after another. It seems to me that the Americans were astounded to some extent. On some issues it seemed as if we had ten levels of reserve positions. I have participated in negotiations many times, but in terms of pressure and intensity this round was unique. We ran a little short of time but we shall be trying to complete the work on the treaty in the very immediate future. What remains to be solved is not even a problem but one aspect of a problem. If we do some proper work on resolving this technical detail then, working day and night, the work could be completed by the end of the month.

[Words indistinct] What is your assessment of the interaction between the military and non-military representatives within our delegation? This question was addressed to M.A. Moiseyev, first deputy minister of defense of the USSR and Chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, who took part in the conversation.

Generally speaking, I would like to drop this issue. It has been around for a long time. The accusation is made against us to the effect that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is working in one key, as it were, and the Ministry of Defense in another. I want to say: We have no disagreements. I was delighted by Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh's stance as a citizen, and as a patriot, standing up for the national interests of our state.

Do you believe that the planned treaty is equal from the point of view of our national security?

We have done everything possible, replied M.A. Moiseyev, and the document we sign will ensure the security of our national interests.

Continuing the conversation, A.A. Bessmertnykh gave an assessment of Soviet-American relations. Now I can forecast the attitude of the American leadership to ties between the United States and USSR, above all on the basis of the talks which have taken place. This was a very significant round and using the Americans' behavior as a premise, one can predict their next steps at least for the immediate future. On the whole, there is an overall impression that the United States Administration favors, first and foremost, concluding a treaty on strategic offensive weapons and this was evident in everything. But also evident was the pressure which it is experiencing from circles that are in no particular hurry with this agreement or who even do not wish it to be signed at all. This was sometimes very apparent when there was suddenly some small movement and the representatives of certain circles very quickly moved in on it.

Second, I think the American leadership—President Bush and Secretary of State Baker—is interested in holding a summit. What will now take place in London is, if one may so express it, a half- summit, and it will in some measure determine the scale and content of the coming meeting in Moscow.

Third, the American side has been fairly frank, not just in the corridors, but also at the conference table and in conversation, in stressing that United States leadership has an interest in the progress of our reform and intends, within its capabilities and concepts, to promote it, especially the transition of our economy to a market basis. At the same time, I have not yet had any sense as to what specific form this is going to take. Especially since we are not taking the line that we are dependent on them and are asking for American aid. If they understand that this is in the interests of the United States, then their help will be welcomed. In the next few days the adminstration will send to Congress the Soviet-American trade agreement. The American side has been interested to know how we are solving the problems of intellectual property, since, as you remember, the agreement itself provides for negotiations on this and the achievement of some movement in this regard. Let me say plainly that as far as the government is concerned, it has proposed appropriate legislation to the Supreme Soviet, but the Supreme Soviet itself has split this problem. It has taken some things from the government program, while leaving the rest up to the Union republics. I told Baker that our government will do everything possible to solve this problem, including efforts in the context associated with joining the Berne convention on copyrights.

Apart from the START treaty we have a large number of other questions in Soviet-United States relations, the minister continued. Many new treaties are being drawn up. Five bilateral agreements have already been completed, and another six are being worked on. But at the same time we feel that not everything is going so smoothly. It is not so much a question of the White House and the State department. Many different things are being said here about the objectives of what is happening in our country. There are many different assessments of our internal situation. Certain people plainly wish to exploit the difficulties which the Soviet Union is encountering, to push it closer to disaster or disintegration. I have the impression that certain circles, which are hostile to the USSR, are now raising their heads once again after having piped down for a while. I again heard certain politicians, who had been holding their tongues, suddenly speaking out again. What's more, they were expressing exactly the same views as before. In a word, Soviet-United States relations are developing in difficult circumstances. And our internal problems are, of course, one of the reasons for the difficulties. If things were going a bit better at home, it would, I think, also be possible to develop relations with more confidence as far as our policy toward America is concerned.

At the recent talks in Washington, A.A. Bessmertnykh said, there was also discussion of certain regional problems, including a Middle East settlement. As initiators of the peace conference, Secretary of State Baker and I exchanged all the information available to us to determine whether there have been any positive changes on this issue. We noted that the measures which are being taken are, indeed, having some effect. It may not always be evident, but we still feel that there are some signs of progress both through the Arab states and, as Baker told me, on the part of Israel. We have recently been in touch with the Palestinians, and those contacts have included meetings in Moscow. They, too, are serious about it. I cannot predict when the conference will be held or whether it will be held—something could wreck it—but we are moving toward it.

Iraq. This is now an acute problem. We mainly discussed questions having to do with the Iraqi nuclear program. Iraq itself, as you know, has submitted documents showing that it has developed a fairly serious program and it was therefore necessary to determine what the international community should do about it. Here we act in the framework of the Security Council and in accordance with the line which the UN Secretary General is now pursuing. We also take account of the work which is being done by the United Nations international inspectors on the spot. The situation arouses anxiety, but at the same time we must give credit where credit is due: Iraq has taken this step of providing the information. Now we must look into all this more specifically and eliminate the elements which are complicating the situation.

As for Afghanistan, A.A. Bessmertnykh said in conclusion, we talked about the possibilities of beginning a practical dialogue between Kabul and the opposition groups. We also discussed prospects of concluding the work on a joint statement on Afghanistan. We had a useful conversation, and charted certain steps which must be taken by both sides.

'Good Chance' for July Treaty Completion

LD1507141191 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Solton on the Washington talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker]

[Text] The talks were difficult—instead of the scheduled two days, they went on for four days—but it has to be admitted that the task before the two leaders was very complex. Within a few days they had to find solutions to problems that experts had failed to resolve within several months and even during several years.

The two ministers and their aides have coped with this task in general. State Secretary Baker said great success had been made in advancing to complete the START treaty, and in the opinion of Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh a great stride had been taken toward concluding the treaty on strategic offensive missiles. Talking to reporters he added that the long path to the accord which has taken more than nine years is actually coming to an end.

Indeed, differences have been removed in Washington on such complicated issues as lowering the countable number of warheads as well as access to telemetric data in test launches of missiles. The only remaining obstacle to a treaty is an aspect related to the definition of a new type of ballistic missile. So what's the hitch?

When (?the) reporters asked the two ministers to elaborate, they refused to do so due to the technical complexity of the problem. But roughly speaking, the idea is this: that changes are needed in the throw-weight, that is, the ability to carry a greater power of the nuclear charge or a larger number of warheads in order to regard the missile as one of the new type. The treaty permits such missiles, but it is important to have a clear definition of their characteristics in order to rule out the possibility of deception in counting how many and what type of missiles each side may have.

Mr. Baker declared that an accord had been reached: A new missile will be regarded as such if its throw-weight has been increased by 21 percent.

So what remains unresolved? Neither Mr. Baker nor Mr. Bessmertnykh wished to say anything on that matter. But experts assume that issues are yet to be solved about defining the parameters either by the length of a missile or by its range.

On Monday specialists continue to work in Washington. It is possible the conclusion of the agreement will be at the working meeting between President Gorbachev and President Bush in London on Wednesday. Anyway, there is a good chance that the treaty will be ready, if not for signing then, in principle for signing this month. That means that the Soviet-U.S. summit in Moscow can well be held at the end of this month or early in August.

Further Comments on Talks

LD1507202291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by B. Kalyagin]

[Text] Talks have ended in Washington between the USSR Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh, and U.S. Secretary of State Baker. They were devoted mainly to tackling problems which are hampering the attainment of a Soviet-U.S. agreement on reducing strategic offensive weapons. [Video shows Kalyagin then Soviet-U.S. delegations seated at negotiating table; then Baker standing next to Bessmertnykh addressing journalists, then Bessmertnykh being interviewed by correspondent; he is seated next to Army General Moiseyev, chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces]

The talks marathon went on in Washington for four instead of the planned two days. The Soviet and U.S. delegations, led by Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker all but succeeded in completing a treaty on strategic offensive weapons.

[Begin recording] [Besmertnykh] The main problem which we have been thrashing out here, and the task which we set ourselves first and foremost to solve, was the problem of reducing ballistic missile warheads. This problem occupied the minds of our delegations for a pretty long time. We finally succeeded in completely resolving this problem on the basis of mutual interests and ensuring the USSR's national security.

Another very difficult problem—a favourite with the press—was also resolved, the problem of telemetry, that is the coding of telemetric information from missiles in test launches. This is a complex matter, but to a significant extent it is connected with the success of the program, so to speak, of openness, and seeing the actions of the other side.

Matters concerning a fundamental problem, the problem of the bombers were also resolved. We found a solution here, and we will regard this matter as having been finally agreed if all the outstanding matters which we have been discussing are regarded as having been agreed.

Unfortunately, one of the small hard nuts in the talks prevented us from reaching final agreement. This matter relates to defining new types of missiles, and in particular, one of the aspects of this problem—the matter of throw weight [zabrasyvayemyy ves], the calculation of throw weight and its increase—that is, which of the stages of increasing the throw weight makes a new missile out of an old one?

[Moiseyev] I might add just that yes, for nine years, this has not simply been fruitful work, but colossal work by an enormous team of all those who have taken part in this process, everyone, the defense complex, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Defense, and I think that we can say today that we are into the home straight. We have achieved enormous, colossal progress, and as was said today at the table where the talks were held, we have reached the point of outstretched hand.

[Kalyagin] Apart from the treaty on strategic offensive weapons, did you discuss other problems with the U.S. side? Were other accords reached?

[Bessmertnykh] We discussed the main international problems relating, primarily, to the search for ways to unfetter talks on the Near East, the Iraq problem, Afghanistan and others. Some time was also spent on bilateral matters, in particular with a view to the prospects for developing commercial and economic links. The Americans spoke of how they are now submitting to Congress a trade agreement, and of the sort of prospects...what, as it were the success of this document getting through is linked with and so on. So that, ultimately, I would say that there was a pretty broad-ranging meeting on some of the more important issues in Soviet-U.S. relations. [end recording]

Depart Washington 15 July

LD1507124591 Moscow TASS in English 1200 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] Washington July 15 (TASS)—On the night from Sunday to Monday, Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh left Washington for home upon concluding here on Sunday negotiations with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on problems of the completion of the work on a treaty on strategic offensive arms reduction.

Chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, First Deputy Defence Minister Army General Mikhail Moiseyev and Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksey Obukhov left for home together with the Soviet foreign minister.

Comments on Talks With U.S.

LD1507174291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1626 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jul (TASS)—This evening USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh returned to Moscow from the United States. He held three rounds of talks in Washington with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on completing the work on the strategic offensive weapons' reduction treaty. The leaders of the foreign political departments of the two countries also exchanged opinions on the present state of Soviet-U.S. relations. They examined some international and regional problems, in particular the situation in the Near East and surrounding Afghanistan.

"At the talks in Washington we managed to resolve the main problems on which differences have persisted between us and the U.S. side for several years," Aleksandr Bessmertnykh stated to journalists when he arrived at "Vnukovo" airport. In the words of the minister, 12-14 problems were resolved all in all, particularly on reducing the number of ballistic missile warheads taken into consideration, and on telemetry. "The complex of issues relating to heavy bombers carrying cruise missiles was also completely resolved," he stressed.

Aleksandr Bessmertnykh noted that "so far one aspect of one of the problems remains unresolved—defining the calculation for the throw-weight of new types of missiles." "This is a very complicated task," said the minister, "since it is tied up with the future development of strategic forces." In his words it was decided to continue talks on this problem.

At the same time, continued the minister, he got the impression that there had been increased activity in the United States in certain circles that are against reaching an accord on strategic offensive weapons. "It is perfectly obvious," he said, "that there are forces in the United States which do not want to conclude such a treaty, or at least they do not want it to be concluded right now."

Aleksandr Bessmertnykh noted that the question connected with the Iraqi nuclear program which is causing serious concern in the international community, was considered at the Washington talks. "The USSR's position on this problem," said the minister, "lies in conducting a line within the framework defined by the UN Security Council." "We maintain constant contact with the U.S. side on this question," he stressed.

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1717 GMT on 15 July in a similar report adds the following information: "Mikhail Moiseyev, the member of the Soviet delegation, first deputy USSR defense minister and the chief of staff of the USSR Armed Forces, noted in his turn that the document which is being elaborated—the treaty on strategic offensive weapons—'fully meets the USSR's national interests.'"]

[Moscow TASS International Service in Russian at 1053 GMT on 16 July in another similar report adds the following information: "Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said that the situation in Iraq was also discussed in Washington. 'in one-to-one talks with Secretary of State James Baker we considered first and foremost Iraq's "nuclear activity," the content of which has been revealed by the Iraqi government itself,' he said, having noted that 'the Soviet line on this matter is that we have to act within the framework of UN efforts, and support these efforts also through the group of UN observers and experts to elucidate the true state of affairs in the region. Overall, we have mutual understanding with the Americans on this matter.'"]

Further Comment

LD1507182991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1626 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Interview with USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Mikhail Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, by correspondent Viktor Leven, on their return from talks on strategic arms reduction in the United States at Vnukovo Airport in Moscow on 15 July—recorded]

[Text] [Levin] You already know that intensive talks on preparing the treaty of the reduction of strategic offensive weapons have been going on in Washington for four days and four nights, I stress days and nights. As a result significant progress has been made in tackling the remaining problems. The problem of lowering the ceiling of warheads which are counted on ballistic missiles has been solved. The accord on the telemetry issue, namely encrypting technical information which is obtained from missiles at the time of test launches, has been reached, and an accord has been reached with regard to bombers. There is only one difficult issue left to be resolved—the definition of the new types of missiles and the calculation of their throw-weight. When Foreign Minister Bessmertnykh and General Moiseyev, chief of the general staff of the USSR Armed Forces, landed in Vnukovo-2 Airport an hour and a half ago I was far from the only Soviet journalist who wanted to interview them. Here is a recording of the conversation:

[Levin] Is it possible to say that the treaty will move even closer to being signed by the time Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Bush meet in London?

[Bessmertnykh] Well, I cannot answer this question categorically at present. A lot depends on how the U.S. side prepares for the meeting. Of course, we also have yet to weigh everything and examine everything. In any case the sides have agreed to continue the discussion of this issue in London.

[Levin] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, one gets the impression that certain forces...er...opposing a Soviet-U.S. rapprochement have become more active recently, and have to some extent been hindering the progress of your talks in Washington.

[Bessmertnykh] Well, Mikhail Alekseyevich [Moiseyev] is witness to the fact that not only were we aware of this through the press and through what one might call the outline of the position to which the U.S. side sometimes adhered, but also that we saw it with our own eyes, so to speak, in the direct actions by some representatives of certain departments who were rather reluctant to move things forward toward agreements. So all of these talks were unbelievably complicated. It had to be like that, for this is one of the most complicated and complex spheres—how to translate technical details, and extremely complicated technical details which bridge many different sciences, into political terms, as Mikhail Alekseyevich quite rightly observed here. Not only that, but very often those technical details were hampered by politics—particularly politics on the other side.

So I want to say once again that the talks were very complicated. This was one of the most difficult negotiating sessions I have ever taken part in; but if you struggle something always comes out of it. It is quite natural that forces exist in the United States which do not want this treaty, or at least do not want it now.

[Levin] Mikhail Alekseyevich, observers are asserting—some of them, at least—that the treaty will contain more concessions on our side than on the U.S. side. What would your reaction be to such assertions?

[Moiseyev] I would not say so categorically. In any matter, big or small, where negotiations are going on to reach agreement, there have to be compromises of some kind. Otherwise you will never reach the truth or find the necessary parameters, which is particularly relevant to armaments. Naturally, over eight and a half years of talks all manner of things have arisen. On some occasions one side had to make concessions and on others it was necessary to hang on to our positions so as to be able to make use of them somewhere else. So through mutual understanding we came up with the parameters which were agreed today.

[Levin] The treaty which is now close to completion—is it in the interests of our national security?

[Moiseyev] I can state loudly and articulately that it is fully in the interests of national security.

China

Dalai Lama Arrives in Buryatia

LD1407170191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0850 GMT 14 Jul 91

[By correspondent Sergey Trofimov]

[Excerpts] Ulan-Ude, 14 Jul—The capital of Buryatia, a Soviet republic in the Trans-Baykal region, has been decorated with colorful images of ancient Buddhist ornaments and emblems and modern designs. The 14th dalai lama, leader of the world's Buddhists, arrived here today for celebrations to mark the 250th anniverary of the official recognition of Buddhism in Russia at the invitation of the Central Spiritual Administration of Buddhists in the USSR. This is his fourth visit to Buryatiya. [passage omitted]

In an interview with the TASS correspondent, the dalai lama's press secretary stressed that the present visit of his holiness [yego preosvyashchenstvo] to the Soviet Union is a private one. At the same time, he is interested in the way perestroyka and democratization are being implemented in the USSR, and how Soviet society is being humanized.

Official on Science Cooperation With China

OW1507134691 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 0200 GMT 13 Jul 91

[From the "Half An Hour With Wang Xiao" program]

[Text] As we have reported, a delegation from the Chinese State Science and Technology Commission, headed by Li Xue, first vice minister of the commission, is now visiting the Soviet Union. The agenda for the visit includes meetings and talks with the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology and with academic units and enterprises in Moscow, Kiev, Minsk, and Leningrad. The Chinese delegation has come to the Soviet Union to attend the fifth meeting of the Subcommittee for Scientific and Technological Cooperation, a permanent organ under the Soviet-Chinese Committee for Economic, Trade, Scienctific, and Technological Cooperation.

Now, our reporter (Yinjilukov) asks Yezhkov, deputy chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology, to comment on the prospects of cooperation between the relevant organizations of the two countries. Yezhkov is now speaking before the microphone at this radio station.

[Yezhkov is briefly heard, speaking in Russian, fading out after a few seconds] He said: Since the fourth meeting of [words indistinct], many important events have occurred in the daily life of our two countries and two peoples and in our relations in the economy and in science and technology. Examples are the transition to the open-type economy and market relations, the reform of the management system for science and technology, and the adaption of international relations in the field of science and technology to the new circumstances. The events that have occurred in our two countries and in the world have provided important prerequisites for radically changing, deepening, and expanding our bialteral cooperation so that it will proceed in a planned way and on a long term basis.

Yezhkov continued: The visit to China last December by Comrade Laveov, chairman of the Soviet State Committee for Science and Technology, was a significant [words indistinct] activity. He discussed with leaders of the Chinese State Science and Technology Commission Soviet-Chinese bilateral cooperation. As a result, they decided on some projects in the fields of new materials and advanced technology for conducting cooperation in science and technology and in production. Agreement was reached on making joint efforts to put our technology to use in China's industries.

Referring to cooperation in basic science fields, Yezhkov pointed out: Presidents of the Soviet and Chinese academies of sciences signed a 1991-95 cooperation plan between the two academies. The plan covers eight fields: ecology, microelectronics, research on oxidation of organic matters, [words indistinct], laser technology, plasma physics research, regional earch structure, and process of mineral genesis. While carrying out this plan, relevant departments and institutes of our academy of sciences will keep direct contacts with their Chinese counterparts so as to cooperate with them in studying numerous questions. Meanwhile, there will be more active regional cooperative between the Soviet Union and China. For instance, the Soviet oblast of Chita has established direct contacts with China's Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region. They have agreed to form a permanent coordination group for approving plans for scientific and technological cooperation between specific research institutes and units. In addition, industrial enteprises in the border region of Khabarovsk are studying scientific and technological cooperation plans proposed by the Liaoning Provincial Science and Technology Commission.

In conclusion, Yezhkov said: We can say with satisfaction that we have taken a practical step to radically improve our cooperation in science and technology so that it will yield benefits just as our cooperation in the economic and trade fields.

Northeast Asia

Japanese Envoy Meets President Gorbachev

OW1507120991 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 12 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The head of the Japanese Foreign Ministry's Department for Europe and ASEAN, Mr. Nagao Hedo, meeting President Gorbachev in Moscow on Thursday, handed in a message from the Japanese prime minister, Mr. Toshiki Kaifu. Japan's ambassador in Moscow, Mr. Sumio Emadura, was also present.

Japanese Embassy officials said afterwards that the meeting was brief, lasting only 20 minutes. They also indicated that Mr. Kaifu's message outlined his considerations about the future of bilateral relations and clarified his Goverment's position on the issue of Japanese aid to the Soviet Union.

A senior embassy official told an IF [INTERFAX] correspondent Japan usually sets three main conditions for its aid to the Soviet Union, adding that this was not to say all of them were necessarily reflected in the message.

To begin with, the Soviet Union must guarantee that it earnestly wants to shift to a market economy. For the time being, said the Japanese diplomat, there is just a general idea of wishing to do so, but the plans available lack clarity. Secondly, there are political considerations relating to further democratic reform in the Soviet Union. And finally, said the diplomat, Japan believes the policy of new thinking must also be spread on to Asian countries, but not confined to the Soviet Union's relations with Europe and the United States alone.

Suzuki, Popov Sign Friendship Agreement

OW1607085491 Tokyo KYODO in English 0409 GMT 16 Jul 91

[Text] Tokyo, July 16 (KYODO)—Tokyo Governor Shunichi Suzuki and Moscow Mayor Gavriil Popov signed an agreement Tuesday on friendship between the two cities.

Suzuki and Popov, in a ceremony at the Tokyo Metropolitan Government Office building in Shinjuku, Tokyo, also issued a joint declaration saying citizens of the two capitals will contribute to world peace and friendly relations between Japan and the Soviet Union by deepening mutual understanding and promoting exchanges, Japanese officials said.

Suzuki presented Popov an honorary citizenship medal.

Tokyo and Moscow originally planned to have a signing ceremony in January, but Moscow asked to postpone the function due to turmoil in Baltic Republics and other internal situations.

The Tokyo Metropolitan Government is scheduled to hold a celebration in the afternoon for establishing friendship relations with Moscow.

Moscow is the ninth city with which Tokyo has established special ties, among the others are New York, Beijing, and Paris, the officials said.

Japan's Press on Yavlinskiy's Reform Plan

PM1207142191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report from IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, INTERFAX, and REUTER roundup: "Japan on G. Yavlinskiy's Reform Plan"]

[Text] The Japanese Government has concluded its analysis of the substance of Grigoriy Yavlinskiy's plan for implementing economic reform, the newspaper YOMIURI SHIMBUN reports. According to information from this publication, official Tokyo has positively assessed the resolute introduction of a market economy stipulated in the program, including the establishment of private ownership, and also the phased implementation of reforms with the aim of concluding them by 1997.

At the same time, the newspaper notes, two negative aspects are pointed out. First of all, the plan does not specify the scale of financial assistance that Western countries are to give to the Soviet Union with the aim of promoting the implementation of the reform program, nor does it specify the possible time-frame for granting assistance. Second, the document does not elaborate a mechanism for the coordination of actions with the leading industrial countries and international financial institutions. "Concern is being expressed in particular about the low probability of the Soviet Union's adopting the program, since the draft is of a radical nature," YOMIURI SHIMBUN writes.

Mongolian Party Celebrates 70th Anniversary

CPSU Secretariat Offers Congratulations

PM1107125391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 91 Second Edition p 1

[Message from CPSU Central Committee Secretariat "To Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee"]

[Text] Dear comrades!

On the noteworthy day of the 70th anniversary of the people's revolution we send you, all members of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party, and the working people of Mongolia cordial congratulations and wishes for success in the cause of the democratic renewal and further progress of Mongolian society.

The CPSU will continue to do everything to help the traditionally friendly relations between our parties and countries to develop dynamically and fruitfully in the common interests of the USSR and the Mongolian People's Republic.

[Signed] The CPSU Central Committee Secretariat.

Mongolian President on Progress, Ties

91UF0983A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[By Punsalmaagiyn Ochirbat, president of the Mongolian People's Republic: "An Anniversary With Hope and Unadorned"]

[Text] Ulaanbaatar—On 11 July we commemorate 70th anniversary of the Mongolian people's revolution. After many years of big successes and no fewer errors, we Mongols are attempting all together to understand who we are, where we have come from, and where we are going.

The states of the Huns, Kidan, and Turki emerged and passed into nonexistence and a most unique civilization of nomadic peoples originated on the territory of Mongolia, in the Great Steppe, at the heart of the Asian continent. It continued thus up to the 13th century, when the successor of these khanates appeared—the empire of Genghis Khan, whom we revere as the founder of a unified Mongol state. We have lost our statehood and restored it. History, by all appearances, is particularly generous in allocating ordeals for small countries and those that are backward in their socioeconomic development. It was as such that Mongolia arrived in 1921.

That summer the centuries-long struggle of our people for national liberation was irreversibly crowned with success, and the people's revolution conquered.

What have we done in the past 70 years? The colonial regime and the power of the feudal lords were overthrown, people's power was established, and an independent people's state was created. The elimination of the serfdom inherited through the ages raised aloft human dignity and the creative spirit and also the economic initiative of the bulk of the population—the stockbreeder-herdsmen. The country achieved self-sufficiency in the basic farming products and created modern systems of education and health care.

Today's appearance of the country's national economy is determined by new sectors. At the start of 1990 industry accounted for 48 percent of the generation of national revenue, construction, 11.5 percent.

During the past 70 years the size of Mongolia's population has tripled, life expectancy has doubled, and illiteracy has been eliminated, on the whole.

These undoubted successes of Mongolia, achieved at a price of the great expenditure of spiritual energy and material resources, contain the tremendous contribution of the peoples of the Soviet Union and other countries which rendered us material and technical assistance.

Mongolia was treading an uncharted path, and by virtue of specific historical conditions its development was accompanied by certain difficulties and contradictions. The establishment of the undivided sway of the one-party system with the total rejection of other views and beliefs, a distorted understanding of the principles of management and, ultimately, a denial of inalienable human rights had, as we today recognize, the most far-reaching repercussions.

On account of its comparatively low level of social and economic development, Mongolia could not have managed without outside support. The help came from the Soviet Union, and we accepted it readily. As a result we acquired, as it transpired, forms of management incommensurable with the specific features of our country with its nomadic way of life and sectoral one-sidedness and also developed within ourselves a firm habituation to fresh financial injections from outside.

The dependent mentality which took shape in this way and permeated Mongolian society from top to bottom and the extremely consumerist approach to the use of national resources and foreign credit were a most serious cause of the economic stagnation, which has been transformed at this time into a full-blown crisis. The people's suppressed national self-awareness was a part of this general decline also since many elements of their traditional culture, including religion with its philosophy, rites, and hundreds of temples and monasteries, were regarded in the ardor of revolutionary enthusiasm only as a legacy of the "accursed feudal past."

This critical approach to the recent period of our history and the objective interpretation of mistakes and miscalculations is encountering understanding on the part of the public, although it is being accompanied also by mental ferment, a polarization of views and an outburst of emotions.

Learning the necessary lessons from the deformations which occurred in domestic and foreign policy and actively seeking ways to rectify them, the people of Mongolia and its government have begun the creation of a genuinely humane, democratic society by way of its radical renewal, which is the cornerstone of the policy of our state. It is here that we find the importance of the celebration of the anniversary of the popular revolution.

It is more than symbolic that the anniversary coincides with the first anniversary of the steps taken to ensure the genuine sovereign power of the people and the formation of a state based on the rule of law. The accomplishment of these tasks occupies a central place in the political life of society.

For the first time in the country's history, elections were held a year ago to the highest state authority—the People's Great Hural—on a multiple-choice democratic basis. The Mongolian People's Republic Small Hural—the standing body of the highest legislative authority—was recreated after an interval of just over 40 years. The office of president of the country, who is, according to the constitution, head of the people's state and guarantor of the independence of Mongolia and the unity of the Mongolian people, was instituted for the first time. Executive authority belongs to the government headed by a prime minister.

An important achievement in the democratization of public life is the multiparty system, which has been officially recognized and is developing. The appearance of increasingly new public organizations and movements, religious included, creates the necessary conditions for the development of political pluralism, which, we believe, should be the foundation for the continued development of democratic processes.

The basic concepts of an improvement of the system of the state arrangement will be reflected in the country's new constitution, the draft of which was put to public discussion a month ago. It is anticipated that it will be adopted this November by the Great People's Hural, whose deputies, we hope, will appreciate the democratic character of the document and the fact that it gives pride and places respect for and realization of human rights and basic liberties and also reveals the idea of continuity of the traditions of Mongolian statehood.

The fate of the political transformations will depend directly on how rapidly and efficiently we undertake the democratization of economic life. The essence of its transition is from a centrally planned economy to the market in its generally accepted sense.

Most important tasks for us, who are taking the first steps toward it, are the following: completion of the creation of the legal basis of the transition to market relations and creation of the basic components of economic management under the conditions of the market and its infrastructure. More than 10 laws, which we deemed the most essential, have already been enacted. These include laws on privatization, labor relations, the tax and banking systems, and the customs service and others.

A fundamental restructuring in the banking and financial spheres is under way, and an official securities market is being created. The government has already embarked on the realization of so-called small-scale privatization encompassing small enterprises of industry, agriculture, trade, and services, and free economic zones are about to be created in the immediate future.

The modern world, in our opinion, is characterized by a trend toward states' greater political independence, although their economic interdependence is simultaneously growing. The economic integration of sovereign states in various regions of the world is increasing, which is beneficial to all the participants inasmuch as it contributes to a consolidation of sales markets and a more rational division of labor. It is in the understanding of this that forms the basis of the open economic policy of our state. Pursuing it, Mongolia is appreciably expanding economic ties to all states which have an interest in this and has joined the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the Asian Development Bank.

We note today that until recently our country's foreign policy was excessively ideologized and was oriented toward a very narrow range of partners. This was reflected in its national interests to a certain extent. We have been attempting in recent years to make the appropriate adjustments to our foreign policy and impart to it openness and flexibility, orienting it toward the skillful and effective consideration of national interests in the international arena and, ultimately, toward the creation of the conditions most conducive to the country's socioeconomic, scientific and technological, and cultural progress. The stimulation of our activity in the United Nations, our actual joining of the Nonaligned Movement, and the steps geared to a broadening of interaction with countries of Asia and the Pacific correspond to these tasks.

As a country that recognizes the wholeness and interdependence of the world and, what is most important, recognizes the need for the creation and defense of its unity by all means available to it, Mongolia aspires to build its relations with all states which are so interested on the generally recognized principles of equality and mutual advantage, territorial inviolability, noninterference in internal affairs, the solution of contentious questions by peaceful means, and renunciation of the threat or use of force.

Talk about Mongolia's foreign policy must inevitably broach the subject of relations with the Soviet Union—a great power whose significance is so great that a decision by this power to change its own thinking and way of life entails on each occasion a chain reaction of changes all around the world. The latest example is the Soviet perestroyka, which has exerted a great influence on the state of mind in our country also.

The further development of equal and mutually profitable relations and cooperation with the Soviet Union in all spheres remains a priority direction of our country's foreign policy. The explanation for this lies not only in geographical vicinity but also in the bonds of longstanding friendship which connect our peoples.

In commemorating the portentous anniversary in the country's history we pay respectful tribute, as always, to the many representatives of the peoples of the Soviet Union who at a cost of their lives contributed to the defense of Mongolia's liberty and sovereignty. We are grateful to the Soviet people for their personal assistance to the current development of our country. The relations of the peoples of the two neighbor states fully justify the popular piece of wisdom to the effect that "a friend in need is a friend in deed." The first Soviet physicians struggled selflessly for the health of our Mongolian patients and lecturers from the USSR and delivered lectures at the Mongolian State University, which was opened, given Soviet assistance, in a most difficult period of the life of our country—in the second year of the Great Patriotic War. We recall that thousands and thousands of Mongolians acquired their qualifications in the USSR and that through knowledge of Russian the majority of our citizens have been and continue to be introduced to world culture and scientific and technological information. We recall also that we too were able in some way to help Soviet people, collecting munitions for the front, giving up the best livestock from our herd, and supporting the foreign policy actions of the USSR with a belief, befitting a devoted friend, in the soundness and expediency of these actions. We recall these things in order to cleanse our hearts, which have, I fear, lost their high tone on account of the disorders of recent times.

Circumstances and the times made their mark on various seams of the history of the two countries' relations. Mention may be made here on the negative consequences for our trade and economic cooperation of the periods of the cult of personality and administrative command system. It is my duty to my people as president to speak also of the deeply wounded national dignity of Mongols, who lost statesmen and their best sons and daughters in the course of the mass punitive measures carried out by Stalin's team and its agents here in Mongolia. Everyone will understand also the distress of a people who had a sacred belief in the necessity and fruitfulness of "all-around and equal cooperation" and who discovered that they owed a tremendous amount, having been unable this whole time to build up economic potential sufficient to return credit.

All this was discussed during the top-level meetings in May 1990 and January 1991. All this is being discussed now at intergovernmental meetings. The parties have agreed that there is much that needs to be preserved and developed today and in the future in bilateral relations and that it is necessary to update and perfect their treaty-legal basis in order to bring them to a far higher quality level based on the principles of constructiveness, mutual advantage, and mutual acceptability.

Actively searching for progressive forms and methods corresponding to the requirements of perestroyka and democracy, we advocate a further intensification of Mongolian-Soviet cooperation, specifically, the development of joint enterprise, the establishment of ties at enterprise and organization level, extensive and free trade, and trade and economic exchange with Russia and other interested Soviet republics.

We believe that consistent implementation of a policy of genuine equality and strict observance of the commitments assumed by both parties could enable us to become reliable partners who need one another and to emerge from the present difficulties with honor and embark as quickly as possible, regardless of the peripeteias of our countries' internal development upon a period of stability and dynamic progress.

I have expressed my thoughts with a belief in the reader and with a hope of understanding on his part. It would be inexcusable not to take full advantage of the opportunity generously afforded by the newspaper PRAVDA—one of the oldest and most-read publications of the Soviet Union.

I avail myself of the right of the president to speak on behalf of the whole people and, being fully confident as to their feelings of profound affection and respect for Soviet people, I convey to the peoples of the USSR the best wishes which a friend can convey to a friend.

Anniversary Reception Held

PM1507152991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "On the Anniversary"]

[Text] N. Mishigdorj, Mongolian ambassador to the USSR, has held a reception to mark the 70th anniversary of the Mongolian people's revolution. It was attended by R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities; V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and other officials.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Leaves For, Comments on Cambodia Talks

LD1607085191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2050 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By diplomatic correspondent Vasiliy Titov]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jul (TASS)—The forthcoming conference of representatives of the five permanent members of the UN Security Council on Cambodia may be a good step forward in the achievement of progress in the matter of a settlement in the protracted Cambodian conflict, Igor Rogachev, the USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, considers. He left Moscow today for Beijing to take part in the meeting of representatives of "the big five," which opens in the Chinese capital on 17 July.

In an interview to a TASS correspondent on the eve of his departure, Igor Rogachev noted that both the rapprochement in the positions of the four Khmer sides, which was recorded in the decisions of the latest sitting of the Cambodian Supreme National Council [SNC] in Pattaya, and the constructive approach toward the search for ways of unravelling the conflict by countries such as Vietnam, Thailand, and especially China, serve as the grounds for such an optimistic forecast.

The fact that the latest SNC sitting is underway on the eve of the meetings between representatives of the "Five" in Beijing is, according to the deputy minister, remarkable. Prince Sihanouk will address the meeting's participants with a report about its results. This, Igor Rogachev says, will undoubtedly aid the success of the meeting.

According to the deputy minister, the Soviet delegation intends to participate actively in the work of the meeting. Besides talks with the direct participants in the meeting, Igor Rogachev said, I hope to meet representatives of all the Cambodian sides, including Prince Sihanouk, who will be handed a personal message from Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, the USSR minister of foreign affairs. If the Beijing round of talks is successful we can realistically count on the final part of the Paris Conference on Cambodia being held in the near future, Igor Rogachev said in conclusion.

Report on Cambodian Peace Settlement

LD1307063391 Moscow TASS in English 1715 GMT 12 Jul 91

["Progress in Cambodian Settlement—TASS Comment" by TASS international news analyst Sergey Afonin]

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS—For the first time since the beginning of the Cambodian conflict, the head of a Phnom Penh government has been invited for an official visit to Beijing. Accepting the invitation, Chairman of the Cambodian Council of Ministers Hun Sen said that during his stay in China he "will do everything possible to find a common approach to the solution of the Cambodian problem".

This is good news and an evidence of great changes in Cambodia and in international relations. Tension between Beijing and Phnom Penh that existed for so long has now eased.

Hun Sen will visit China after a meeting of leaders of the Cambodian parties to be held in Beijing on July 16-17 and following his trip to Pyongyang together with Norodom Sihanouk.

China welcomed the idea expressed at a recent meeting of Cambodia's Supreme National Council at Phatthaya, Thailand, that the Cambodian parties should meet in Beijing in mid-July. China also expressed the hope that they will observe the agreements reached in the interests of political settlement to the Cambodian problem.

The most important of these agreements between Cambodia and the tripartite opposition are their statements about timeless ceasefire and refusal from foreign military aid, as well as the decision to set up the headquarters of the Supreme National Council in near future in Phnom Penh. There are a number of unresolved problems connected with some political and military aspects and with the United Nations participation in settling the conflict.

Incidentally, Cambodia made a concession by admitting to Phnom Penh "Khmer Rouge" representatives to the Supreme National Council.

Hun Sen stressed, however, that the arrival of Pol Pot men in the capital during a political settlement "will not mean that genocide regime is legalised or restored in power". At the same time, Phnom Penh declares that it is not going to reject those of Pol Pot's former supporters who abandoned their policy and wish to participate in a political settlement. This approach is in the spirit of national concord being asserted in the country.

Prince Sihanouk's proposal for a moratorium on arms supply from the outside to the opposing Cambodian sides begins to be implemented. Vietnam expressed support for this initiative the other day and stated the readiness to assume the obligation not to allow the passage of armaments for the Cambodian parties over its territory. Vietman is prepared to discuss this subject with Laos and Thailand. A similar statement was made today by the Lao Foreign Ministry.

The striving of the Cambodian sides for national reconciliation should be supported, and a favourable atmosphere for the ultimate settlement of this regional conflict should be preserved.

Assessment of China's Role in Cambodian Conflict

BK1407105991 Moscow Radio Moscow in Cambodian 1100 GMT 13 Jul 91

["Article" by (Aleksey Kondrachev)]

[Text] The Cambodian crisis has always troubled the international community. Representatives of the five countries, the permanent members of the UN Security Council, want to hold a meeting in Beijing on 18 and 19 July to provide contributions aimed at speeding up the UN plan on solving the Cambodian problem. In other words, Beijing is the second center for solving the Cambodian problem after Paris. Comrade (Aleksey Kondrachev), our commentator, has written an article, of which this is the essence.

The warring Cambodian parties will hold an informal meeting in Beijing prior to the meeting of the representatives of the Security Council's five permanent members in order to find a formula for an agreement to implement the UN plan. In my view, China will play a major role in the search for this formula. It can not be ruled out that at last the Paris boat of Cambodia, called the UN plan, will leave its blocked position and start its voyage from Beijing. I think this can be done.

There is no doubt that the China factor has always been present in the confrontation of warring Cambodian parties. Beijing has provided support and military aid to the tripartite group and the Democratic Kampuchean government and refused to recognize the Phnom Penh government, which it considers as so-called men of Hanoi. However, it seems that this stance has been partly changed. The evidence is the invitation for Comrade Cambodian Prime Minister Hun Sen to pay an official visit to China. One may almost say that the change in attitude toward the Cambodian conflict took place through Chinese diplomacy, after an analysis of the real situation in Cambodia. Reality has clearly shown that the power issue cannot be settled through military means. Furthermore, China values the independent policy of Comrade Hun Sen's government, which is not under foreign influence, and Comrade Hun Sen's middle-of-the-road policy regarding a solution. Has this government not scored a victory in seizing power over a large part of the country's territory?

Lately, Beijing has constructively cooperated with the international community who have aimed to provide assistance in solving the Cambodian problem. As one among those who have worked out the UN plan, China has tirelessly implemented its policy. China has affirmed that the halt of aid to warring Cambodian parties should be the essential condition in the search for a solution.

Our commentator continues: I think that because of Beijing's stance, the Khmer Rouge have agreed to a cease-fire and a halt in receiving foreign military aid at the meeting of the Cambodian Supreme National Council held in Phatthaya, Thailand.

Thus, the Chinese factor has started to play a positive role to eliminate a source of tension in Indochina.

Shenin Meets Delegates at CPV Congress

PM1107135091 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "Continuity and Innovation"]

[Text] As has already been reported, a CPSU delegation headed by O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in the SRV 22 through 29 June. The delegation took part in the work of the Seventh CPV [Communist Party of Vietnam] Congress, visited labor collectives in Hanoi, and met with Vietnamese-Soviet Friendship Society activists.

Meetings and discussions were held with delegations from the Cambodian People's Revolutionary Party, headed by Comrade Heng Samrin, general secretary of the party Central Committee and chairman of the State of Cambodia's State Council; the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, headed by Comrade Kaysone Phomvihan, chairman of the party Central Committee and chairman of the Lao People's Democratic Republic Council of Ministers; and the Communist Party of Cuba [PCC], headed by Comrade Yolanda Ferrer, candidate member of the PCC Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the Cuban Women's Federation.

At the conclusion of the work of the Seventh CPV Congress, the CPSU delegation was received by Comrade Do Muoi, who has once again been elected general secretary of the CPV Central Committee.

During the meetings and discussions a high appraisal was given of the fraternal parties' efforts to preserve traditional mutually advantageous ties between our countries, which are both following a course of socialist renewal. It was stressed that at the present time it is particularly important to maintain balanced economic relations on a mutually advantageous basis taking into account the actual potential of both countries. Both sides came to the unanimous conclusion that pooling the efforts of the fraternal parties will have a positive effect on the improvement of relations between our countries.

Economic Relations With Vietnam Pondered

PM1207134191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 91 Second Edition p 5

[Report by correspondent V. Pritula: "So Are We Leaving? Reflections on the Problems of Soviet-Vietnamese Cooperation"]

[Text] Hanoi-Ho Chi Minh City-Moscow—Everyone is probably well aware that a man who intends to set off on a journey, especially if the journey is not a short one, is in a resolute frame of mind. But when he is already at the airport he unexpectedly learns that his trip has been postponed. It is particularly unpleasant when you are impatient to return home from abroad, but for a number of reasons which are always simply objective from Aeroflot's point of view, you are told that you have to wait. For how long? Who knows...

At Ho Chi Minh City's Tan Son Nhut Airport we were not the only unlucky travelers by far. Despite the astronomical ticket prices, Vietnamese flights are as packed as they were before, although economic relations between our countries leave much to be desired. There was not enough room for us and therefore we had to wait at least a week for the next flight. In a word, it was time to calmly reflect on what we had seen and heard in recent days. And these were the thoughts that gave me no peace.

The indifference and occasional irritation which Vietnamese workers and students frequently encounter in their relations with Soviet people have gradually started to replace the universal goodwill that was shown toward the elegant and fragile people who fought heroically with a superpower and emerged victorious in one of the fiercest wars of the second half of the 20th century.

Some people were quick to blame the bareness of our counters on the 100,000 Vietnamese who work at various enterprises in our country. They do indeed export irons, refigerators, washing machines, and juice extractors from the USSR. But they are earning rubles, after all, and it is impossible to exchange these for dongs. So they have to barter them. And they know how to do this. Otherwise customs officials would not remove from their boxes so many goods that are in short supply. True, they are far from being angels. But should we denigrate them all without exception? The Vietnamese newspaper DAI DOAN KET published a letter from a group of women working in the Soviet Union.

"Because of the complex changes that are taking place," the letter says, "many Vietnamese citizens who are in the USSR implementing the international division of labor program have voluntarily abandoned their work and are embarking on a course of action that involves serious violations of the laws... At present there are a significant number of Vietnamese citizens being sought by the militia for crimes they have committed. However, up to now they have remained at large and, moreover, they are organizing criminal groups... Cruel and merciless vengeance awaits anyone who informs the militia of their illegal activities. There were cases in which bandits robbed workers of tens and even hundreds of thousands of rubles. With this money they buy goods at speculative prices to send off to Vietnam and live a life of pleasure and entertainment... We earnestly request," they say at the end of the letter, "that the SRV Interior Ministry, the Labor Ministry, and the Main Administration for the Labor Integration of Vietnam immediately establish close contact with the Soviet militia and render them every assistance in restoring order to Vietnamese collectives as soon as possible and providing reliable protection for the life and property of peaceful workers at risk from their own criminal compatriots."

So runs this cry for help. The problem of Vietnamese workers in the USSR has not cropped up overnight. It is simply that people preferred not to publicize it before. We glorified internationalism and, as in many other fraternal countries that were friendly to us, we funded the construction of facilities in Vietnam that were planned on a grand scale but were not always so useful in terms of the return they yielded, and creditors were generous and sometimes not very wise. And meanwhile other countries are investing their capital in Vietnam with considerable profit for both sides.

To ensure that my remarks are not groundless, I shall give some examples.

The Japanese company JVC, which is today already exporting television sets to Vietnam, and the Sanyo Corporation, which manufactures household appliances, are planning to open representative offices in Ho Chi Minh City. The Bank of Tokyo, which had a branch in Saigon between 1962 and 1975, is considering the possibility of reopening a branch in Vietnam. "This will happen once we become aware that the Cambodian situation and the Vietnamese economy have improved," Kazuhiro Miya, the bank's official spokesman, said. "Our business in Vietnam is predetermined by the policy of the Japanese government, which in turn is based on relations with the United States. But when U.S.-Vietnamese mutual relations improve we shall already be several steps ahead of the Americans."

Many business people see Vietnam as a market which will soon be on the move. The World Bank has concluded research which shows that the economy of this country is similar to the economy of South Korea in 1965, which at that time was starting to emerge from a long period of economic stagnation.

The economists from the World Bank believe that Vietnam, in striving to attract foreign capital, has gone even further than East European countries in formulating liberal investment and banking laws. For example, Vietnam's new investment law makes provision both for joint enterprises and for 100-percent foreign ownership of local enterprises.

At the present time the U.S. Administration is coming under growing pressure from business circles demanding an end to the 15-year-old trade embargo, and not only businessmen from the Asian region but also business people from the Old World have become regular visitors to Vietnam. "Signs of an upturn have been noted in the Vietnamese economy, and the Vietnamese themselves know just how to adapt to the changes in trading circumstances on the world market," Hans-Bernd Giesler, general secretary of the German South-East Asia Association, stated.

The South-East Asia Association, whose members include major German companies like Hoechst, AEG, Bayer, BASF, and others, has for many years been investing capital in various sectors of the Vietnamese economy: pharmaceuticals, communications, telecommunications, and the manufacture of agricultural products for export.

The French are striving to develop oil fields in the south of the country. But in the struggle for a place in the Vietnamese sun, the former metropolitan country is encountering extremely fierce competition from Japan, Hong Kong, Australia, and South Korea.

So where have we gotten to? Since signing a Treaty on Friendship and Cooperation in 1978, 250 industrial facilities have been built with our assistance. Thanks to these, Vietnam produces 60 percent of all the electricity it consumes, 87 percent of its coal, and 40 percent of its concrete. In the almanacs we are listed as Vietnam's main trading partner. But should this perhaps already be in the past tense? The Vietnamese side accepted the transition to mutual settlement of accounts in freely convertible currency with no particular enthusiasm, since they understood that mutual commodity turnover was declining sharply.

At the same time Vietnam is interested in many of our commodities which are essential for its future economic development and the completion of its infrastructure. However, at the present time Vietnam has already had to deal with the unreliability of Soviet suppliers, which was the subject of a major discussion during the recent meeting of the two heads of government in Moscow. I hope that the situation in this area will be rectified.

The image of Vietnam that prevailed among our economic managers during the decades of cooperation remains to this day one that assigns it a place among supplicant nations. But this is a mistake. The Vietnamese have already overcome the malaise of dependency. And they can perfectly well buy the products they need from the "tigers" of Asia—at higher prices, maybe, but better quality...

True, if we are being objective, I should say that the Vietnamese and Soviet foreign trade organizations have not yet lost heart entirely. Thus at the exhibition organized recently in the city of Vung Tao, over 1,000 different products manufactured by Soviet enterprises were on show. Moreover, the Vietnamese showed particular interest in equipment that could operate within the framework of a small-scale family production unit, which is the most highly developed mode of production in Vietnam. The relatively low prices, simplicity, and reliability of many Soviet finished products make them preferable for cooperative and private workers. But will trade remain buoyant after the excitement of the exhibition dies down? It is hard to give an unequivocal answer, because once again we come up against the notorious question of freely convertible currency, which is what all the intermediate structures, for example the carriers, are nowadays asking the producer to pay.

Formerly there would have been an order to give Vietnam everything it needed! And we used to give. With the collapse of the administrative edict system, a serious crack has formed in our economic ties. It is likely that questions relating to the future development of Soviet-Vietnamese ties were at the top of the agenda during Vietnamese leaders' recent working visits to Moscow. The Soviet Union enjoys as high a level of prestige in the countries of Indochina as it did before. People here know how to value friendship, and it is not so simple to wipe off the collaboration that has been established over the decades. People in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia remember and value the solidarity that Soviet people showed during the years in which the peoples of Indochina struggled for their national independence.

It is all the more annoying to encounter in the pages of some of our pseudoindependent publications the sorts of arguments that say we have no special interests in this region. Some writers still believe that Vietnam is dependent on us, although all existing agreements are founded on strict mutual obligations. They state that the time has come to say: "Good-bye, Vietnam!" These attitudes exist, and it is impossible to brush them off.

...And so I am standing at Tan Son Nhut Airport, a world away from home, unsure of whether I will fly out in a week's time. Wiping the perspiration from my face, I try to smile at the distressed woman from the Ho Chi Minh City office of the Ho Chi Minh Communist Youth Union, for whom the forced extension of our visit promises nothing but trouble.

Next morning, however, life seemed brighter. Probably because of the radiant sunshine. And even the fact that we no longer had a car, which our hosts could no longer afford to hire, did not dampen our spirits. All week we roamed around the city on foot, which the local pedicab or "cyclo" drivers found hugely amusing. These Saigon rogues know very well that Soviet people will not travel in rickshaws. It is said that there is some sort of instruction to this effect.

However, you can find something positive even in situations like this. On the streets of Ho Chi Minh City we once again glimpsed the revival of a businesslike and energetic Vietnam. It is the same in Hanoi, where the dozens of people who used to spend hours sitting self-absorbed and consumed by fatalism on the shores of the Lake of the Restored Sword have now vanished, and the inhabitants of Vietnam's largest city have gotten down to business and found faith in themselves and the future, which now seems like a real future to them and not as gloomy as it was a short time ago.

People have shaken off the lethargy of torpor and doom. This is probably the principal merit of the current renewal in Vietnam. God grant that we too should find confidence in the success of perestroyka and not lose friends at this difficult time.

Near East & South Asia

Reportage on Iraqi Nuclear Issue

U.S. 'Logic' in Threats Noted

LD1507224491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By international observer Yuriy Tyssovskiy: "TASS Observer on U.S. Threats Against Iraq: Another War?"]

[Excerpts] [No dateline as received] On Sunday in its popular Larry King program, CNN broadcast a conversation with Congressman Steve Solarz. The U.S. legislator, who returned recently from a trip to the Near East, tried, most convincingly in my opinion, to give grounds for striking a new blow against Iraq which has not obeyed the resolution of the UN Security Council ordering Baghdad immediately to put at the disposal of the experts of that organization all the data about its nuclear potential. [passage omitted]

If S. Husayn is really trying to lie and wriggle out of things in this ticklish business, the U.S. side's logic is quite clear. In any case, U.S. President George Bush has laid it out in very uncompromising terms. [passage omitted] Brent Scowcroft, the President's national security adviser, confirmed on Saturday that the United States is considering "alternatives" for action against Iraq. [passage omitted]

So, another war? How far is this approach justified?

Baghdad certainly deceived the UN inspectors when in April this year the first document on the problem of Iraq's nuclear research asserted that it is of a purely peaceful nature. The inspectors did not believe it. And when they attempted to look at one of the facilities, they were not permitted to enter. Nevertheless, they managed to notice and even photograph several trucks driving out of the gates with suspicious loads. After this well publicized event the Iraqi authorities produced another 29 page document on 7 July which contained a forced admission that nuclear developments of a military nature had been made, in particular in the area of the technology of enriching uranium to produce nuclear "explosives". This was "slightly enriched uranium". At the same time, Baghdad informed the United Nations that it had already destroyed almost all its nuclear installations. [passage omitted]

There is a great variety of reactions, including the further tightening up of economic sanctions, which are already "biting" the Iraqi population quite painfully. As for the United States striking a military blow on behalf of the multinational forces, in spite of the assertions by S. Solarz, such actions do need the approval of the UN Security Council, it would seem. Nevertheless, the threat is a very real one. Baghdad has presented the UN inspectors with a third, longer, list and appealed to the UN Security Council and Arab League to prevent the planned action. At the same time a not unfounded argument is put forward: Israel already has (according to the information of Western experts) at least hundreds of nuclear warheads with their means of delivery, and on the banks of the Potomac there is no plan to take sanctions against Tel Aviv.

Many observers see in this a selective approach, when principles are sacrificed to purely political considerations. In my opinion this does no honor to U.S. diplomacy. As for S. Husayn, he should think thrice about the possible consequences of attempts to deceive the world community and finally open up to UN inspectors his nuclear secrets to their full extent. Such a terrible weapon should not be a source of danger for the states of the region.

Iraqi Explanation Carries 'Little Weight'

LD1307184691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 13 Jul 91

[Commentary by Yuriy Soltan]

[Text] The question of whether Iraq retains the capability of making a nuclear bomb of its own or of how to force Baghdad to comply with Security Council resolutions for the elimination of a large part of Iraqi weapons, including technologies for the production of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destuction, was the subject of widespread discussions last week, including at the United Nations. This commentary is by Yuriy Soltan.

One United Nations expert of the commisson for disarming Iraq reckons Baghdad's stockpile of enriched uranium is big enough to produce more than 10 nuclear bombs. In a letter to the United Nations the Iraqi Foreign Minister had to admit that his country was engaged in embracing a covert nuclear program after a series of incidents when the UN inspectors were denied access to Iraqi military installations, from which nuclear-related equipment and materials were being taken elsewhere. However, Baghdad's belated explanation carried little weight. The U.S. NBC television network reported that Defense Department analysts had pinpointed a number of possible sites which President Saddam Husayn used for the burial of uranium-enrichment equipment while telling the world he had nothing to hide. Regardless of the NBC report there is the danger of a new flare-up of hostilities in the Gulf.

Referring to Defense Department officials, the NEW YORK TIMES said President Bush had approved about 20 Iraqi command and communication points as possible targets for U.S. aerial strikes. The operation, codenamed (?Makeup Test) provides for the destruction of the Iraqis' nuclear capability, which they managed to keep intact after the Gulf crisis.

Is Baghdad trying to provoke further tensions in the region or could it be that Washington is looking for an excuse to do away with the regime by President Saddam Husayn? Whatever the case the resumption of fighting in the Gulf could seriously heighten tensions in and outside the region. Presumably the United Nations must step in quickly before that happens. UN experts are due to submit a report at the Security Council on 15 July about the Iraqi nuclear program and how it is being checked by a team of inspectors of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Regardless of the report's findings, the United Nations have ample means to force Baghdad to comply with its resolutions.

Moscow Urges Iraqi Disclosure

LD1507182491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] The American President, George Bush, has approved a list of about 20 Iraqi possible targets to be hit should Baghdad refuse to comply with the demands to eliminate its nuclear potential. These comments by Yevgeniy Khrushkin.

International inspections to examine the Iraqi nuclear sites, as well as materials and equipment meant for nuclear research, were one of the conditions to a ceasefire in the Gulf, the conditions Baghdad was forced to accept. The aim was to prevent the creation of nuclear weapons by Iraq that could destabilize the situation in the Near and Middle East. But, as is known, the compliance with the nuclear condition has faced obstacles. Iraq did not allow representatives from the International Atomic Energy Agency to examine some military bases in that country, thus giving grounds for Washington to conclude that Baghdad conceals facts about its possible nuclear program.

The American actions are actually an ultimatum to the Iraqi government. The U.S. position is also shared by its partners Great Britain and France. President Francois Mitterrand of France has not excluded a possibility of another use of force against Iraqi if the latter does not comply with the UN resolutions. Speaking over the national television, Francois Mitterrand said that the use of force would be justified for the sake of preventing the Saddam Husayn regime obtaining nuclear weapons.

Why go to such extremes? The United States and its allies have also other and quite efficient means to pressurize Baghdad. Take for instance the economic sanctions against Iraq that are still in force. I see the reason in Washington and its partners choosing a tougher course in their desire to cause further damage to the Iraqi ruling regime and removing Saddam Husayn from his post, and of late the Americans do not attempt to conceal their desire in this respect.

But in this sense Baghdad's position is unclear. What do they hope to gain when they put up obstacles for the International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors? In the final account these actions are detrimental to the Iraqi leadership itself because they arouse suspicions as to the Iraqi nuclear program and its character. It would be better to supply full information about its nuclear sites and potential, as demanded by the UN Security Council members.

Bangladesh Foreign Minister Pays Visit

Meets Sobchak, Trade Minister

BK1207163391 Dhaka Radio Bangladesh Network in English 1530 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Text] Foreign Minister A.S.M. Mustafizur Rahman, now on a visit to the Soviet Union, has had talks with the mayor of Leningrad City, Mr. Anatoliy Sobchak. They discussed matters like setting up joint ventures and visit of Bangladesh trade team to Soviet Union. Mr. Sobchak showed keen interest in developing trade ties with Bangladesh and welcomed ideas from the Bangladesh foreign minister for greater interaction.

Earlier, in Moscow, the foreign minister held talks with Soviet Economic Relations Minister Mr. Katushev on economic relations between the two countries. Trade and Soviet assistance to different areas in Bangladesh, including the power sector, also came up for discussion.

Communique on Visit

LD1307113591 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS—A Soviet-Bangladesh communique circulated here today says that Foreign Minister of the People's Republic of Bangladesh Mustafizur Rahman was staying in the Soviet Union on an official visit from July 9 to july 12.

During the stay in Moscow Rahman was received by USSR Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev, and a friendly conversation was held.

USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and Mustafizur Rahman had negotiations on a broad range of problems of mutual interests. The sides confirmed the readiness to continue to develop Soviet-Bangladesh cooperation in the interests of the peoples of both countries and of building a secure and non-violent world.

The sides manifested similar approaches to problems of disarmament, of establishment of a fair and equitable international economic order, strengthening of cooperation between members of the world community in environmental protection and dealing with ecological crises.

The USSR and Bangladesh declared for further actions to strengthen stability in the Asia-Pacific region through confidence-building measures and a dialogue to prevent confrontation.

The Soviet side welcome the efforts for the further strengthening of interaction of South Asian states in the framework of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC).

The Bangladesh foreign minister summed up the present stage of the country's democratic development and the government's efforts to overcome economic difficulties.

He was informed of the perestroyka processes in the USSR and the main aspects of a Union treaty prepared for the signing, a treaty about a federal democratic state of a new type.

Bilateral relations and prospects for their further development were also discussed. The need to continue the quest for new directions and areas of mutually advantageous cooperation was noted.

Bessmertnykh and Rahman signed a consular convention between the USSR and the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

Rahman met Soviet Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev.

The Bangladesh minister went sightseeing in Moscow and made a trip to Leningrad.

The visit passed in the atmosphere of mutual understanding, respect and benevolence, reflecting the traditionally friendly character of Soviet-Bangladesh relations.

Rahman invited Bessmertnykh for an official visit to Bangladesh. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

Report on Kidnpapped Soviet Engineer's Death

PM1207145591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 91 Union Edition p 5

[Article by V. Skosyrev under the "Follow-Up" rubric: "How Did Sergey Grishchenko Die?"]

[Excerpts] Our newspaper wrote yesterday that there was hope that Soviet specialist Sergey Grishchenko, kidnapped by separatists in the Indian state of Assam, would be released. Here is what TASS correspondents reported from Delhi. [passage omitted]

[TASS report begins] Reports coming from Gauhati indicate that the Soviet engineer was killed two days ago, on Sunday [7 July]. This is evidenced, in particular, by the 7 July statement by Sidharthi Phukan, "United Assam Liberation Front" spokesman, which was only circulated late in the evening of 9 July. So, people here point out that "United Assam Liberation Front" extremists held talks with the Assam Government on releasing their confederates from jail, deliberately misleading the opposite side [TASS report ends].

The story, based on Indian news agency reports, needs to be checked out. According to reports from reliable sources, Moscow is awaiting reports from Delhi on the results of the official investigation into the circumstances surrounding the Soviet citizen's death. There is no doubt that the government of the friendly state will establish the true facts and convey them to the Soviet side. However, the following question arises: Was everything done to rescue S. Grishchenko?

The USSR Foreign Ministry South Asia Directorate told us: As soon as we learned that our specialist had been abducted, the Soviet ambassador in India and the consul general in Calcutta asked the central Indian government and the chief minister of Assam to take all the necessary steps to secure his release. The Indian authorities, including at prime minister level, assured us that everything possible would be done. In particular, to this end a representative of the Assam government entered into direct contact with the rebels.

Regrettably, the tragedy could not be averted. That is why we must today think about how to avoid such cases in the future. We are not calling for contacts to be broken off or to stop sending our specialists to "Third World" countries. Not at all. But conclusions are needed. Whereas previously every Soviet citizen traveling abroad studied an exclusively formalist conduct book on rules of behavior, it would be no bad thing today to give them a professional briefing on how to act in emergencies. After all, separatists and fanatics, prepared to secure their ends at any cost, are, regrettably, at work not only in the Indian state of Assam.

Separatists Refuse To Hand Over Body

LD1207211191 Moscow TASS in English 1156 GMT 12 Jul 91

[By correspondent Aleksey Polyanskiy]

[Text] New Delhi July 12 TASS—Separatists from the United Front of Assam's Liberation (UFAL) refuse to fulfill a demand by the administration of the North-Eastern Indian state of Assam, insisting on giving the body of Soviet specialist Sergey Grishchenko whom they abducted.

The Soviet consulate-general in Calcutta also insists on this demand. It issued a statement demanding that the Assam state government provide information on particulars of the Soviet specialist's abduction and assassination.

A group of Soviet engineers who worked at the Lido mine in the Tinong coal basin, lived in the village of Magheriti. They occupied six small houses called "Russian Colony" by local residents.

Only Grishchenko, interpreter Ruslan Takhautdinov, his wife and daughter were at "the Russian Colony" on July 1 at 17:00.

On hearing a knock at the door, Takhautdinov went out of the house. Two unidentified people ordered that Takhautdinov follow them. He refused. Then, one of the bandits leveled a pistol at him.

Takhautdinov grabbed the other attacker and ducked behind him. The first attacker did not fire, but they knocked the interpreter down. A fight began. Hearing the noise, Takhautdinov's wife ran to her husband's rescue.

Grishchenko also joined the fight. But forces proved to be unequal after the third bandit, armed with a rifle, appeared on the scene. Struck by the rifle butt, the Takhautdinovs, husband and wife, lost their consciousness. Takhautdinov also received a light knife wound.

The terrorists dragged Grishchenko to the street and put into a Maruchi microbus. He resisted them and shattered a bus window. Some witnesses claimed that they heard a shot at that time.

The microbus drove to the city of Tinsukia. Attempts by police that soon arrived at the scene to chase the bus failed.

The front's separatists took about 20 Indian civil servants from various parts of the state on the same day. The front demanded that the Assam government exchange them for six previously arrested separatists. Otherwise they threatened to kill the Soviet specialist and an Indian hostage. Before the deadline of the ultimatum expired, the Assam government announced its agreement to fulfill the front's demand and even amnestied all the front's imprisoned gunmen.

"However, separatists announced on July 9 that Grishchenko was allegedly killed in an attempt to escape.

The assassination of the Soviet specialist by separatists caused serious concern among foreign nationals in Assam and other areas in eastern and north-eastern India.

The Hindustan TIMES newspaper reports that the spokesman of the Coal India company, under the contract with which about 200 Soviet specialists work in various Indian regions, announced additional measures to ensure their security.

Additional security measures were also taken to protect engineers from Germany, Australia and other countries.

Indian-Soviet Journalists Association Meets

LD1307041491 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 12 Jul 91

[By correspondent Alexey Solodov]

[Text] Moscow July 12 TASS—A press conference of president of the Indian-Soviet Association of Journalists Harbhajan Singh was held here today.

The idea of close professional cooperation of Indian and Soviet journalists proved to be so promising and evoked such a lively interest in India that [it] led to the creation of our association, Harbhajan Singh said.

Friendly Soviet-Indian relations, he continued, are a serious factor of modern international life. Journalists from our two countries can do much for ensuring the successful development of those relations in our quickly changing world. It is noteworthy that the Indian Government understands it and renders effective assistance to our association, he said.

The accomplishments of the association include the signing of a protocol on the exchanges of journalists between India and Uzbekistan. The first group consisting of eight people will arrive in India next autumn. They will make a trip around India at the association's expense and will meet the leading public figures and politicians of the country.

I believe that the Indian-Soviet Association of Journalists has a promising future, which is also true of the Soviet-Indian Association of Journalists, which is being formed in the partner country, Harbhajan Singh said.

Analyst Criticizes Afghan Communique

LD1507220491 Moscow TASS in English 2139 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By international analyst Yuriy Tyssovskiy]

[Text] Moscow July 15 TASS—The heads of the three most extremist rebel groups—the Islamic Party of Afghanistan (IPA), the Islamic Society of Afghanistan (ISA) and the Islamic Union for the Liberation of Afghanistan (IULA)—signed a joint communique in the Pakistani city of Peshawar on Sunday.

Their names are well known both inside and outside Afghanistan due to the fact that Golboddin Hekmatyar, Burnahuddin Rabbani and Abd ar-Rasul Sayef are completely immune to the idea of a peaceful settlement of the Afghan problem.

The content of the Peshawar document matched this reputation. It rejected a U.N. proposal to form a coalition government in Afghanistan, consisting of representatives of warring political forces.

The document contains hackneyed calls for a jihad (holy war) "to the victorious end", that is to the overthrow of the Afghan Government in Kabul by force.

Such proclamations are issued by extremist rebels in Peshawar nearly every week. The last one would not have drawn attention if not for one interesting circumstance.

The communique issued for Afghans, among whom even mullahs are not well versed in Arabic, was written precisely in this language. The Arabic ligature showed the extent, to which fanatic rebels depend on outside forces meddling in the conflict.

These forces are oblivious of the Afghan people's sufferings and are guided only by "the purity of Islam" rather than by the idea of ending the 13-year-old war in that country.

One ISA activist admitted that the communique was signed under pressure from "Arab figures having direct links with the international organisation Muslim Brothers".

It is indicative that the three above rebel leaders had been members of the Muslim Brothers organisation in their young years. This organisation had functioned in Afghanistan during the rule of King Zahir Shah.

Rebels also received subtantial military and financial aid from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Egypt and other Arab states, especially after the dispatch of Soviet troops to Afghanistan.

Late Pakistani President Ziaul Haq also contributed much "to Islamize" even more Afghan muslims through Hekmatyar's services. On the other hand, Saudi Arabia staked on the IULA leader, an ardent supporter of the Wahhabi trend in Islam, giving also substantial aid to Hekmatyar.

Afghan people often say that the conflict would have been settled long ago if not for the outside interference in the war. This interference is seen everywhere now. The Gulf war confused affections of former patrons.

Hekmahyar and Sayef lost Saudi support, since they were sympathetic with Saddam Husayn. Pakistan voiced support for a peace plan in Afghanistan nine weeks ago, which was drafted by the U.N. secretary-general, although there are no clear evidence of substantial changes in Islamabad's position.

It turns out that the vacuum has been quickly filled by fanatic Islamic fundamentalists from Arab countries, which is corroborated by the Peshawar communique. Evidently, the more blood is shed for the same of their version of Islam, the better for them.

True, such extremists do not enjoy much influence among the Afghan people. Nevertheless, the present alliance of Afghan and Arab fanatics is disquieting. The Afghan people need peace and not various varieties of Islam, the more so since they conceal personal ambitions of some rebel leaders striving for power.

S. Lebanon Problem Seen in Context of Settlement

PM1607084491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 91 Second Edition p 6

["Editorial Office Commentary": "The South Lebanon Knot"]

[Text] Lebanesé Prime Minister 'U. Karami has described last week's flare-up of fighting in the south of the country between the Lebanese Army and Palestinian detachments as an unfortunate episode of disagreement between brothers. These tragic events, in which more than 50 people died, again reminded the world about one of the most acute and painful problems of the Near East—the fate of the Palestinian refugees who have fled the Israeli occupation and found refuge on the territory of their much-afflicted neighbor Lebanon.

The new Lebanese Government, having ended by political means the civil war that raged for many years in the country, is making efforts to regain control over the state's entire territory. This is the reason for its desire to station Army units in regions which were under the control of local and foreign militia detachments (that is what they call the military formations, including Palestinian formations) and to disarm them.

Beirut's efforts came into conflict with the stance of the Palestinians, who were not opposed in principle to the stationing of the Lebanese Army in the region of their refugee camps, but insisted that an agreement be concluded with the Lebanese Government allowing them to continue the struggle for national rights. That is, to keep their weapons. This misunderstanding was the cause of the fighting, which fortunately was stopped, again thanks to political methods of resolving conflict.

A. Stepanov, our correspondent in Lebanon, reports that the country's government believes that the question of the Palestinian population's fate should be finally resolved in the context of a general Near East settlement, and that progress toward such a settlement could begin by untying the South Lebanon knot.

In order to achieve true territorial integrity for the state, the Lebanese Government, in addition to what it has already done, must seek fulfillment of UN Security Council Resolution 425, which provides for the withdrawal from the country's southern regions of Israeli Army detachments which are controlling a section of Lebanese territory to a depth of between 6 and 14 km, describing it as a "security zone."

As for the Palestinian presence, the actions of resistance detachments against Israel have yet to lead to the liberation of a single inch of the occupied territories, but they have resulted in countless tragedies and sufferings for the inhabitants of the refugee camps and for the Lebanese population. The center of the struggle is now shifting to the occupied territories, where the people's uprising—the Intifadah—continues unabated.

Radical solutions are needed to the Palestinian problem, which influences all sociopolitical life in the Near East. Clearly the Palestinian people's right to self-determination must be ensured by democratic means, an end must be put to the Israeli occupation of their lands, and an independent Palestinian state must be created. These questions should be resolved by the world community, especially since the idea of convening an international conference on the Near East appears to be close to materializing, thanks to the efforts of many countries, the Soviet Union among them.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Policy Directions, Goals in RSA Debated

91UF0977A Moscow NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA in Russian 27 Jun 91 p 4

[Article by Vasiliy Solodovnikov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Premature Euphoria: Soviet Interests in Southern Africa: What Are They?" followed by article by Tatyana Krasnopevtseva of the USSR Academy of Sciences Africa Institute: "The Esteemed Correspondent Is Barking up the Wrong Tree With His Criticism of the 'Total Reconsideration of Our Positions'"]

[Text]

Republic of South Africa

Many of our newspapers have of late been publishing articles about Soviet policy in Southern Africa. This can only be welcomed for the Soviet press, both "democratic" and "communist," is now shunning problems of the "third world," yet this is where the vast majority of mankind lives. I would like to express my viewpoint also on this problem based on several decades of study of South Africa as a scholar and diplomat.

What is the essence of the problem? The colossal inequality in the living standard of black (32 million) and white (5 million) South Africans. The ordinary white has a better life than that of oblast and republic level leaders in the recent past, at whose privileges we have been rightly railing. The ordinary black has a far worse life than our miners, whose demands have evoked our sympathies. The discrepancy in the living standard of blacks and whites boggles the imagination (yet South Africa's prosperity was created by the joint labor of blacks and whites), and the blacks intend to tolerate this situation no longer.

The reforms are now being spoken of such as to suggest that apartheid has already been eliminated. Yes, truly, movement in the direction of the dismantling of apartheid has begun. The African National Congress [ANC], the Pan-African Congress, and the South African Communist Party have been legalized, certain racist laws have been abolished, and some political prisoners have been released. But the changes have yet to assume an irreversible nature. Violence against democratic organizations has recently assumed so extensive a nature that the ANC has been forced to suspend its participation in the dialogue with the government. The euphoria in respect of the pace of a settlement has begun to subside. The majority of countries, Western countries included, deem it necessary, as before, to observe economic, cultural, and academic sanctions against South Africa.

For quite a long time our interests in Southern Africa were predominantly ideological: The national liberation movements were seen as one of the three streams of the world revolutionary movement. Today practically the whole world community is applying in respect of South Africa the Soviet formula: isolation of the government and support for the national liberation movement.

There are various modifications of this policy. It might on the surface appear that the West is, as before, supporting South Africa and ignoring the ANC, but in practice there has been a tremendous turnabout in the West's position. The Western countries' economic sanctions are making a very substantial contribution to nudging the South African Government into reforms and the accomplishment of change by the peaceful path. As far as the ANC is concerned, this organization is today being courted most assiduously by all who have any real interests in South Africa, including the governments and big business of Western countries.

We, according to Western estimates, have spent comparatively little on support for the ANC—far less than the assistance of even the smallest of the countries which are friendly toward us. What is most important is that we rendered this assistance at the most difficult time for the ANC—in the 1960's and 1970's, when the organization operated under clandestine conditions. At this time the USSR was practically the sole major country supporting the ANC. But in recent years, precisely when the real importance of the ANC had been revealed and when our positions in Southern Africa had come to be considered very strong, we began to make an inexplicable and, in my view, illogical turn in the opposite direction. On the pretext of the need for dialogue with all parties to the conflict in Southern Africa, we considerably broadened contacts with the South African government while simultaneously cutting back on relations with the ANC, whereas the expansion of relations with the government should have been accompanied by redoubled attention to the ANC. I believe that the whole world is now watching with perplexity how we are striving mightily to saw off the bough on which we are sitting.

The contours of a settlement in South Africa are already emerging. This process will be long and complex, but few people doubt that political power will ultimately be transferred to a democratically elected government. Possibly the ANC will not form a new government exclusively, nor, evidently, does it aspire to do so. But considering its special role in the past 80 years, it may be assumed that the ANC will play a key part: it has a pretty good chance of gaining the office of president of the country, a majority in parliament, and key offices in the cabinet.

Why is South Africa important to us? It is a powerful industrial state, and if we aspire to move out onto the world market, we should under no circumstances disregard this capacious and solvent market. But we should not be deluded as regards what awaits us there. A serious competitive struggle for South Africa is already under way, and our chances will largely depend on whether we are able to correctly dispose of the political capital accumulated in the decades of support for the liberation struggle.

But it is in this sphere that we appear particularly insipid. Almost a year prior to Namibia's independence top businessmen could be seen in the reception areas of the leaders of the Southwest Africa People's Organization, who had just returned to the country (when their chances of victory were still considered debatable). Our first economic delegation, on the other hand, showed up in Namibia when all the others had completed their business. The same thing could happen in South Africa also, but not through the fault of the ANC but on account of our own lack of dispatch.

South Africa produces approximately 36 percent of world gold output and holds key positions in the world in the recovery of diamonds, nickel, manganese, and certain other strategic metals. I believe that the advantages of cooperation between the USSR and the country occupying leading positions in this sphere is clear to the nonspecialist even.

It is important not to fall behind in the preparations for economic cooperation with South Africa. But it is just as important not to get ahead of events either. Many people in our country perceive South Africa as a new Klondike, and the international sanctions, as an invention of our administrative command system. But they are now a generally recognized instrument of international pressure. If we are renouncing ideological approaches and giving priority to values common to all mankind, we would not be wrong in behaving in such a way that our conduct correspond to the generally accepted standards. Until our actions go beyond the framework of soundings, a blind eye will be turned to this: it creates for the West a favorable propaganda background for attempts to lift sanctions. But any attempt at broad-based cooperation would be cut short decisively.

The intention of some of our businessmen (the state sector included) to charge into the South African market at a sudden spirited horseman's dash, not on the basis of current political relations but in defiance of them, would condemn our business people to considerable difficulties from the beginning. Is it that hard to imagine the humiliating position of our businessman, who, instead of receiving assistance in the conclusion of a contract, would be reminded of our behavior at the final stage of the settlement in South Africa. Things are as yet headed in precisely this direction!

By virtue of many factors we are in an unpropitious starting position compared with the West. But we can insert ourselves in the South African market not by premature, rash actions, which could damage not only the reputation of the USSR but also the potential participants in business relations themselves, but through the maximum use of the friendly relations we have established with South Africans in the shape of the ANC, which, I would remind you, will, it is generally acknowledged, be a key component of a future government of South Africa.

There have now appeared quite a number of people who, having journeyed to South Africa (frequently at the invitation and expense of organizations connected with the South African Government, and it has tremendous experience of "propaganda tourism"), are declaring the need for a total reconsideration of our positions. Even worse is the fact that these people are frequently well aware of the alignment of forces in South Africa, yet are, nonetheless, pushing the USSR into steps which could have a deleterious effect on the prospects of our prospective cooperation with this country. An example of this is IZVESTIYA journalist B. Pilyatskin, who for many years held the "Pretoria regime" up to shame and praised the "ANC patriots." But today he is arguing that "ANC functionaries, who are simultaneously members of the South African Communist Party... are putting pressure on the moderate wing of the ANC... demanding that it not agree to compromise."

V. Tikhomirov, author of a recent article in NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA, is also encountering this same problem. The young, capable scholar is suddenly starting to employ the obsolete propaganda cliches of the South African Government in respect of the "wave of terror being mounted by ANC militants in the guise of 'armed struggle' for 'socialism.'" We can understand V. Tikhomirov's grievance over a disrupted trip to South Africa, but, after all, the academic boycott policy is quite flexible and logical. The criterion of the permissibility or impermissibility of scientific ties to South Africa is simple—do these ties contribute to the elimination of apartheid or not. V. Tikhomirov, evidently, has the honor of being the sole target in the USSR of charges of having violated the academic boycott. And he knows why. The circumstances accompanying his trip to South Africa last March evoked sharp protests not only there.

As far as I know, both the American side and the Africa Institute were wholly at one as regards the need for the coordination with the ANC of all aspects of the creation of a diplomatic school at the University of Transkei. But this was not done. The attempts to isolate the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries [SCSAAC] as some sinister organization appear absurd also. Many associates of the Africa Institute, of which V. Tikhomirov is academic secretary, are active participants in the affairs of the SCSAAC, and the institute director is a deputy chairman of the SCSAAC.

Throughout the world all the main political forces are cooperating on the problem of apartheid: communists and social democrats, believers and nonbelievers. I would like to call on the political forces in our country also for interaction in the accomplishment of a principal task of mankind in the latter half of the 20th century—elimination of the shameful system of apartheid.

* * *

P.S.

The burden of V.G. Solodovnikov's article amounts to the fact that our country should squeeze the maximum profits from the political capital it earned in the 1960's-1970's, when it contributed to the radicalization of the ANC. The author believes that now, on the eve of the complete dismantling of apartheid, our state must under no circumstances alter its policy in respect of South Africa, otherwise it runs the risk of forfeiting its advantages in the struggle for the South African market.

Let us try to view the Soviet-South Africa problem from different standpoints. The essence of it, in our view, lies in the eternal counterpoise of advantage and morality in policy, which since the times of Machiavelli has been an endless topic of philosophical and political debate.

The morality of the struggle for abolition of the unjust apartheid regime and advantage from well-established contacts in the course of this struggle with an organization which will undoubtedly be a principal political governing force in post-apartheid South Africa have coincided here, unexpectedly for us, it would seem. This, however, is only the tip of the iceberg. The submerged part is the fact that South Africa and the USSR are essentially brother states which have for the greater part of the 20th century implemented two experiments different in appearance but identical in essence: South Africa has attempted on the basis of compulsion to achieve the maximum possible separation, demarcation, and isolation of different racial groups, while the USSR has on the same compulsory power basis separated groups of classes, and far more brutally than South Africa. The methods employed by the ruling circles of both countries to achieve their ends were not simply far from morality—they were criminal. If, furthermore, we compare the dimensions of the crimes committed in this strange historical competition, it may be acknowledged that the Soviet Union firmly retained first place. If the problem of Soviet-South African relations is viewed from these standpoints, it has to be acknowledged that the ANC, setting itself the pure and just goal of the achievement of racial equality, for many years obtained assistance from an organization whose hands were stained by the blood of an infinite number of victims of its own people. Receiving help from the hands of executioners could not have failed to have influenced the moral principles of the recipient. The communist ideology of intolerance, hatred, and dictatorship so familiar to us gradually filtered through from Staraya Square to the ANC together with money and weapons via the South African Communist Party.

The years of communist influence made their mark: The ANC of the 1980's was a far cry from the positions it occupied at the start of its historical path. Can we in our day speak of a common position of the ANC? Just as in our present CPSU, there are groups of a directly opposite persuasion there. They have their Polozkovs and their Rutskoys.

Relations between the USSR and South Africa have always been of a clannish party nature. It was with good reason that in the USSR- South Africa Society formed recently the determining positions were taken by the Solidarity Committee, the Friendship Society, the Moscow State University Asian and African Countries Institute, and the Africa Institute, which are known for their accountability to the Central Committee and the KGB.

The meaning of V.G. Solodovnikov's phrase "...we have considerably broadened contacts with the South African Government while simultaneously cutting back on ties to the ANC..." is totally inexplicable in this connection. Who are "we"? After all, the ANC was in contact only with the CPSU or its factotums, consequently, the question of a reduction in support for the ANC needs to be put in Staraya Square.

After all, neither the USSR Council of Ministers nor the Supreme Soviet have ever dealt with South African issues. Testimony to this is the absence of a sanctions law, a law which is in effect in many other countries. This last circumstance merits in-depth reflection, come to that. Sanctions are a multifactor phenomenon:

Whereas on the one hand they have truly contributed to an acceleration of the dismantling of apartheid, they have on the other engendered a deterioration in the economic situation in the country and led to incitement of political unrest and instability.

The distorted nature of Soviet-South African relations has had the effect of the Soviet side becoming a hostage, as it were, to its own ideological dogmas, which are becoming forever a thing of the past. But it is now, when the USSR has ceased being a monolithic evil empire fettered by the will of one party structure, that a real opportunity for the building of Soviet-South African relations on a truly high-moral basis, which can alone lead to the mutual advantage and prosperity of our peoples, has emerged.

In order to improve Soviet-South African relations it is necessary to switch them from the party to the state level. The ANC may obtain support not from party functionaries, for whom at home the very word "democracy" is profanity, but from legitimate parliamentary structures. It is necessary to expand in every possible way contacts with the South African Government, which under the difficult conditions of the constant threat of a right-wing coup very reminiscent of our domestic situation has practically completed the series of reforms pertaining to the dismantling of apartheid. It is necessary to end the blockade on contacts with the South African public set up by Soviet organizations which monopolized these contacts in the past. Finally, it is necessary to take advantage of the broadening of contacts at all public levels for the sake of the achievement in South Africa of freedom, democracy, and civil harmony.

What does the term "national liberation movement" mean in relation to the black majority? As an Africa specialist, V.G. Solodovnikov cannot fail to know that the white population of South Africa is just as indigenous as the black population and that it is impossible to achieve liberation from it by kicking it out of the country. It can only be a question of the black majority's acquisition of full civil rights.

The demand for proof that the apartheid process has assumed an irreversible nature [as published] is in principle an impossible business, just as impossible as demanding proof of the impossibility of a return of Stalinism in the USSR. This is a condition which cannot be met in principle. It can only be a question of a qualified assessment of the current situation and current trends, not of historical proof and guarantees.

The complaints that in the sphere of competitive struggle for the South African market "we" appear particularly insipid stand out. It is hard to believe that V.G. Solodovnikov does not know that all the dates when it is "possible" to go are determined in the CPSU Central Committee International Department. It is hard for Soviet Africa specialists and economists to accept this "we" on their bill.

Government Watching South African Situation

OW1207053991 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1200 GMT 11 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] U.S. President George Bush has announced the lifting of sanctions against South African Republic introduced five years ago. Simultaneously, the International Olympic Committee has abolished the ban on South African sportsmen participation in the Olmpics. The Soviet Foreign Ministry is expected to make an official announcement on the subject any day.

The Soviet Union is closely following the developments in the South African Republic, officials from the African Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry told DP's [Diplomatic Panorama] reporter. The USSR is set to contribute to the fast demolition of the apartheid regime in that country together with other countries and the UN, said one diplomat. He added that it was quite natural for the USSR to take into account the strategic objectives of establishing and cementing trade with that country.

He did not rule out the possibility of the matter coming up for discussion at the current talks between the Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, and said it could surface at the upcoming Soviet-American summit in Moscow. At the same time, he pointed out the agenda for both meetings may be so crammed that the discussion may never get around to regional problems, particularly as specific as the situation in the South African Republic.

Gorbachev Congratulations to Mandela Published

PM1207100391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Jul 91 Second Edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev message to Nelson Mandela on election as ANC president; date not given]

[Text] To Nelson Mandela, president of the African National Congress of South Africa [ANC]

Esteemed Nelson Mandela,

Please accept my congratulations on your election as ANC president.

Now that South Africa is at a crucial phase in its history, the ANC and the South African people need your prestige, multifaceted experience, and ability to build a policy based on common sense.

I wish you health, success, and fruitful work in the interests of all your fellow citizens and I wish South Africa a political settlement and the creation of a democratic state.

M. Gorbachev.

Examination of Problems Hindering Angolan Peace

91UF0986A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Jul 91 Union Edition p 5

[M. Pavlov report: "Refugees Are Rediscovering Their Homeland"]

[Text] Luanda—Members of the delegations of the USSR, the United States, Portugal, the government of the People's Republic of Angola, and UNITA which are a part of the Joint Military-Political Commission (JMPC) for a settlement in Angola visited the UNITA Headquarters in Jamba, where they were received by its leader Jonas Savimbi.

A UNITA delegation is simultaneously in the Angolan capital. Driving daily past the Hotel Turismo, where part of this delegation is staying, I observe one and the same picture. There is a permanent crowd of young people, who are interested in talking with members of UNITA, here. A recent political mass meeting, which had been organized in Luanda by this organization for the first time, was also well attended. But there are many Angolans who, as before, see the UNITA representatives as enemies. Thus at the said hotel a group of war invalids attempted to express their attitude toward them in highly distinctive fashion, throwing their crutches at them. A minibus used by Savimbi's emissaries was attacked by enemies of UNITA. Both instances required the intervention of the police.

The relatively composed and restrained response of the UNITA leadership to such attacks is noticeable. S. Pena, head of the UNITA delegation, declared that UNITA is not seeking pointless bloodshed and believes that the peace agreements signed in Portugal are the sole path leading to Angola's salvation and permitting the prevention of war, in which, according to him, both the MPLA [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola] and UNITA have an identical interest.

Aside from these two mutually contending forces, other organizations, which have within the framework of the current law acquired the status of political parties in opposition to the governing MPLA, have begun to join the fray increasingly assertively. Specifically, the National Front for the Liberation of Angola, the Democratic Party of Angola, the Social Democratic Party of Angola, and others have advocated a national conference for discussion of possible ways of eliminating the most serious problems in the political, economic, and social fields. Simultaneously they are demanding that the government make available to them more quickly the necessary premises, monetary resources, transportation, and access to the mass media and are also insisting on a release of all political prisoners, the announcement of an amnesty, the abolition of the political police, and the disarmament of militarized formations from the civilian population.

In response to these statements Marcelino Mouco, recently elected general secretary of the MPLA Central Committee, said, inter alia, that there is at the present time no need to convene a national conference, as certain members of the opposition are demanding. In addition, citing the experience of individual African countries, he emphasized that holding such in the present phase of the development of the situation in Angola would be extremely dangerous for the peace process. At the same time, according to Mouco, the question of the creation of a national advisory body, in which it is contemplated incorporating representatives of all political parties and other organizations, including the church, is being studied at this time. It is planned to establish it this year. The main purpose of this body is study of all the draft laws that will be presented to the People's Assembly.

As certain observers believe, the situation in Angola remains tense, despite certain positive processes. No, UNITA is not now blowing up water supply and power lines. The JMPC and other commissions are operating. The clearing of roads, bridges, and fields of mines is under way throughout the country, practically. Information is coming in on the return to Angola from neighboring countries of refugees, 300,000 of whom, according to a report in JORNAL DI ANGOLA, will before the end of the current year rediscover their homeland. But, on the other hand, the Front for the Liberation of the Enclave of Cabinda (FLEC), which has been silent for many years, is making its presence known. S. Pena, leader of the UNITA delegation on the JMPC, does not rule out his organization, together with the MPLA, being forced to carry out joint combat operations against the FLEC.

In addition, difficulties in questions of the creation of a single army and the founding of new state institutions and other problems, which will intensify as the elections approach, are arising.

East Europe

EC Efforts on Yugoslavia Said 'Useful'

OW1607052091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet Union considers the EC effort for a negotiated settlement in Yugoslavia to be useful. Officials of Foreign Ministry's 3rd European department reaffirmed that the Soviet position on the crisis in Yugoslavia expressed in statements on June 26 and 28 was unchanged. By all accounts, the Soviet Union is unlikely to come up with any new initiatives related to Yugoslavia for the time being at least. The Foreign Ministry did not place any stress on last week's talks with Yugoslav federal and republican leaders by Mr. Gorbachev's special envoy, Mr. Yuliy Kvitsinskiy, describing the mission as fact-finding alone.

'Fratricidal War' in Yugoslavia Reported

91UF0976A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 10 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

[Special article by IAN correspondents S. Gryzunov and A. Baturin, under the rubric "Report From No Man's Land": "Yugoslavia: The Fratricidal War"]

[Text] Tenja-Osijek-Belgrade—**A few days ago negotiations ended between a delegation of the EEC composed of the ministers of foreign affairs of the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Portugal and representatives of the supreme federal and republic leadership of Yugoslavia. The government of Slovenia agreed to return the state border of its territory to the jurisdiction of the federation. A compromise has been reached for a period of three months—control and protection of the border will be carried out by Slovenians, and customs duties will go to the state treasury after a long interruption.**

The local commentators view the meeting at Brioni as a positive step, however they are fairly skeptical about the prospects of stabilizing the situation in the country, believing that Slovenia will not consistently adhere to the decisions that have been made. The events of recent weeks have confirmed this several times when the forces of the territorial defense of Slovenia were the first to violate the truce and open fire. At present the center for combat operations (boyevoye deystviye) has been moved to Croatia, where bloody skirmishes between Serbians and Croatians have become a common phenomenon. Judging by recent reports, clashes between units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the republic and subunits of the Yugoslav People's Army have increased in frequency. This is a new level, a new stage in the escalation of violence in the country which may draw an enormous mass of people into the fratricidal war.

We visited this region of Croatia. We offer our report from the site of the events.

In one night Tenja, a village close to the Croatian city of Osijek, has become the center of a conflict between Croatia and Serbia. This little town, settled by both Serbians and Croatians, is the main subject of newspaper and television reports. This is why, almost at dawn, we rushed there together with Viktor Nogin and Gennadiy Kurinnyy, correspondents of Soviet Television.

It is not far from Belgrade to Tenja, 150 km on a good road, but at the border, which is not presently marked, between Serbia and Croatia we were stopped by the first patrol. There was an examination of our documents and a search of the automobile and our personal things. Across the road were heavy tractors, combines, plows, and harrows which had been overturned.

Something incomprehensible in our documents stopped the patrol of the Croatian people's guard and the police so they led us to the headquarters of the territorial defense in the city of Vukovar. Two sleepy assistants of the chief lazily flipped through our passports and press credentials. The walls of the rooms were adorned with a picture of the leader of the republic in a gold frame, an automatic pistol, and an operations map.

"You may continue on. But we do not guarantee your security on the territory of Serbian villages where the terrorists have established themselves. Yesterday REUTERS correspondents were assaulted there."

We do not know precisely what happened to our British colleagues, but it is a fact that journalists are being treated poorly these days in Yugoslavia. Two Austrians died in Slovenia, and several people were roughed up in a scuffle, and our local colleagues have let loose a crossfire on one another from the pages of their publications. The direction of the propagandistic attacks depends on ethnic affinity. Along with the civil war there is a war of the mass media.

The population on our way was mixed—a Croatian village, then a Serbian village, then a mixed village. Just yesterday their residents had tilled the land together, and today they are divided by barricades and mutual hatred. There were no people on the streets. The windows were covered by shutters. They did not permit the television photographers to take pictures along the road. The Serbians explained to us that if the film were to fall into the hands of Croatians, it would go poorly for the former.

On the approach to Tenja was the last police post and some abandoned automobiles. They let us through, and the car, with the large letters TV attached to the doors and hood, slowly rolled down the street of the town, which had become a neutral zone.

The entry to the village was closed off by a combine, two tanks, and an armored personnel carrier with a machinegun turret. Meeting us watchfully, the people were noticeably tense. They accompanied us to the local organ of power, which had been moved to the building of a former school and was now turned into a defense headquarters. At the entrance was a guard armed with a hunting rifle.

Having learned that we were Russians, an elderly woman approached and said with tears in her eyes, "Do not believe the evil slander. There are no terrorists here. These are our own people, our husbands and sons. They are not attacking Croatians. They are defending our homes."

To anticipate, we will note that the mutual accusations of the Serbians and Croatians were very serious. The more victims the current armed conflict brings, the harsher the accusations become. The Serbians, recalling the cruelties of the Croatian nationalists who assisted the German and Italian fascists during World War II, continue to call their neighbors Ustashi. The Croatians are quick to retaliate, calling Serbians everywhere Chetnik terrorists. (Detachments of Chetniks were formed in the last war from Serbians loyal to the royal throne).

Under such circumstances it is difficult to clearly answer the question of who opened fire first in Tenja. The local residents and the officers of the Yugoslav People's Army (YPA) state that on that night units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Croatia and members of the people's guard opened mortar fire on the village. Defenders of the village responded with rifle fire and grenade launchers.

The other side declared that it was conducting a normal operation to purge the Croatian territory of terrorists and encountered fire.

Today Tenja is divided into two parts: One part is held by the Croatians and the other part by the Serbians. A chain of tanks and armored personnel carriers of the YPA serves as a buffer. We did not hear shots during the day, but we saw the results of the shooting. The roofs of houses had gaping holes from mortar fire. Along Savskiy Street there ran a border occupied by armored vehicles of the YPA. Croatian snipers controlled the open space. The previous day they had killed a tank crewman of the YPA, Senior Sergeant Gavritsa Gayinov, who had left his vehicle in order to render aid to a Croatian militiaman. The Croatian side, however, stated that "the sergeant was shot by Chetnik terrorists." That side, according to the Osijek newspaper GLAS SLAVONIYE, also killed a captain of the YPA and a commander of a tank.

On the corner of Savskiy and Dravskiy Streets stood a two-story stone house scorched by fire and with an enormous hole where the entry to a store used to be where snipers had been firing at the defenders of the village. What had caused them to fall silent? Judging by the scale of the destruction, the shot was from a sizable weapon. Around the house was a lot of blood and empty cartridge cases. Inside there were numerous holes from the fragments of the shell. It smelled strongly of gas. In front of the house was a body in the form of a Croatian guardsman with terrible wounds on his body. On the waxen forefinger of his left hand was the pin of a grenade. He lay on his back, and the wind ruffled his light brown hair.

These questions trouble more than just Yugoslavia these days. They trouble all Europe and the world. How can the bloodshed be stopped? So far there is no answer to this question.

Bulgarian Army Chief on Military Doctrine

LD1107160691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 11 Jul 91

[Text] The Republic of Bulgaria renounces the policy of force and war as an instrument for the attainment of political ends, says the new military doctrine of Bulgaria. The basic tenets of this document have been approved by the country's National Security Council and were set out at a press conference in Sofia for Bulgarian and foreign journalists by General Minchev, first deputy defense minister and chief of the general staff of the Bulgarian Army. In his words, the main aims of the military doctrine of the republic are the prevention of possible war against Bulgaria and maintaining the readiness of the Bulgarian Armed Forces to come to the defense of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country at any time. Answering a question, the military chief said that Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation in the military field, just as in all other areas, is being put on a new level. We think, he said, that our army, including its weapons, equipment and munitions, could not exist at the present time without the support of the USSR Armed Forces.

Falin Holds News Conference in Warsaw 12 Jul

AU1507132991 Warsaw ZYCIE WARSZAWY in Polish 13-14 Jul 91 pp 1,4

['J.B.'-signed report: "We Are Still Neighbors"]

[Text] "Poland is an autonomous entity and will never be a bargaining chip in relations between the USSR and other states, and all speculation on the subject is groundless," said Valentin Falin, CPSU Central Committee and head of the CPSU Central Committee Foreign Department, at a news conference in Warsaw on 12 July.

"President Lech Walesa's visit to the USSR will have an official character and should, at the same time, yield concrete results. Over the past few weeks, we have noticed progress in preparations for the visit, and we have ascertained that there are numerous points on which there is agreement and which now have to be formulated in an appropriate manner," said Falin following his meeting with Foreign Minister K. Skubiszewski.

"If there is a so-called Falin doctrine or a 'continuation of the Brezhnev doctrine,' then what it comes down to is that one should not forget one's neighbors and should not approach relations with them emotionally or with prejudices," said Falin. "At a recent meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat it was stressed that changes in Eastern Europe 'do not mean the end of the world.' The development of Soviet-Polish relations should be based on the principle that we are neighbors and that our economies are complementary. We should not pretend that we have no neighbors, because their policies have changed in some respects."

The issue of security is of first-rank importance in Soviet-Polish relations. Mutual obligations regarding this question come down to imposing certain restraints on each country. On the scale of the European continent as a whole, the security of one state means the security of all states, and that is not a military, but a political issue.

"A positive turning-point has been reached in negotiations on the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Poland," said V. Falin, "because the deadlock has been broken. A schedule and conditions have been agreed upon for the withdrawal of the forces, and currently, the talks that are still in progress concern the financial aspect, which," he stressed, "should not be confused with the substantive aspect."

Contacts between the CPSU and the SDRP are based on the principles of equality, honesty, sincerity, and independence. "There is nothing of 'a teacher-pupil relationship' about them," said Falin, "and each party is concerned about national interests first and foremost."

Report on Visit

LD1407201791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1417 GMT 14 Jul 91

[Text] Warsaw, 14 Jul (TASS)—V.M. Falin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and a member of the International Affairs Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet was in Warsaw 11-14 July at the invitation of the Social Democracy of the Polish Republic (SDPR).

His friendly conversations with Aleksander Kwasniewski, chairman of the main Council of the SDPR, and Leszek Miller, general secretary of the Central Executive Committee of this party, examined issues of deepening cooperation between the CPSU and SDPR.

There were also meetings and conversations between V.M. Falin and Mikolaj Kozakiewicz, speaker of the Sejm; Andrzej Stelmachowski, speaker of the Senate; Krzysztof Skubiszewski, foreign minister; Wlodzimierz Cimoszewicz, chairman of the Democratic Left Parliamentary Floor Group; Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Democratic Union Party; Archbishop Bronislaw Dabrowski, general secretary of the Polish Episcopate of the Catholic Church; and Mieczyslaw Rakowski, chief editor of the journal 'DZIS'.

All these meetings, which were held in a constructive spirit, touched upon various aspects of the socioeconomic and political situations in the Soviet Union and Poland, prospects for developing Soviet-Polish relations, and participation by both sides in the pan-European process. Stress was laid on the importance of increasing Soviet-Polish cooperation in all areas, based on the principles of equal rights and mutual advantage.

V.M. Falin also took part in a news conference for Polish and foreign journalists, and addressed the aktiv of Soviet institutions in the Polish Republic.

Soviet Battalion Starts Withdrawal From Poland

PM1507102191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[By V. Burbulis: "First Train"]

[Text] Warsaw, 10 Jul—The withdrawal of the 902nd Separate Pontoon Battalion of the Northern Group of Forces from Torun (Northern Poland) has begun. The first transport train carrying heavy equipment has set out by railroad for the USSR. It will take three such trains to move out all the equipment, the unit's entire personnel, and the servicemen's families.

West Europe

12 Nuclear Missiles Removed From Germany

LD1307182291 Berlin ADN in German 1745 GMT 13 Jul 91

[Text] Berlin (ADN)—In the past week the Soviet Union has withdrawn 12 more missiles with nuclear warheads from the territory of the former GDR. The BERLINER KURIER AM SONNTAG learned this from Soviet military sources.

Thus, Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has kept a promise he made to Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl during their meeting in Kiev last week. They were improved Scud missiles with a range of 2,000 kms.

The so-called Fox's Den, the German command headquarters of the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact in the event of nuclear war, has in the meantime awakened the interest of American arms producers. Last week a delegation from a U.S. company inspected the establishment in a disused mine near Bad Saarow, in the Rauen Hills. The four floors, under 20 meters of concrete, were still full of the most modern electronics at the Soviet Union's disposal. The missiles near Waren-Mueritz, Pinneberg near Schwedt, Jena-Lobeda, Eisenach, and Lychen had been controlled from the "Fox's Den". The establishment had been handed over to the Bundeswehr. (The article was pre-released in an edited version—ADN)

German Defense Official Cited on Cooperation

LD1407153691 Moscow TASS in English 1522 GMT 14 Jul 91

[By correspondent Vladimir Pavlushin]

[Text] Berlin July 14 TASS—Decisions taken by Mikhail Gorbachev and Helmut Kohl during heir meeting in the Caucasus are of exceptional importance, Illy Wimmer, parliamentary state secretary of the German Defence Ministry, told the ADN agency on the occasion of the anniversary of the Soviet-German summit in Stavropol territory.

The accord reached then on reunited Germany's NATO membership and on a reduction of its Armed Forces down to 70,000 not only paved the way for German reunification but also removed all confrontational aspects in the Federal Republic's relations with neighbouring countries, Wimmer emphasised.

There are now favourable chances to utilise the basic elements of the policy of constructive European and transatlantic cooperation to ensure access for Eastern European countries to the western region of welfare, he said.

In this respect the forthcoming Group of Seven (G-7) summit in London has good prospects to finally draw the line under the old war period and move away from the confrontation of the two systems to East-West cooperation involving the peoples of the Soviet Union, Wimmer said.

UK's Hurd Interviewed on Gorbachev Visit

PM1407184591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[Interview with British Foreign Secretary D. Hurd by TASS General Director L.N. Spiridonov; date, place not specified: "Facilitating USSR's Integration in World Economy"]

[Text] On the eve of USSR President M.S. Gorbachev's visit to London British Foreign Secretary Douglas Hurd granted TASS General Director L.N. Spiridonov an interview.

[Spiridonov] Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has been invited to London to meet with the heads of state and government of the "big seven," which meeting promises to be historic if only because it is unprecedented in the history of East-West relations. Britain played an important part in arriving at this decision. What does the British Government expect of the meeting, and are there differences in the way the members of the group of seven approach the upcoming talks?

[Hurd] We are looking forward to President Gorbachev's visit to Britain and particularly his talks with the participants in the economic summit. It will indeed be a historic event. We—and, I am sure, all our partners in the group of seven—very much hope that it will mark the start of a new process of cooperation and dialogue between us. It is perfectly clear that the question of financial aid will not be examined at the summit meeting. I believe, though, that its participants will want to discuss with President Gorbachev practical ways of effecting cooperation, involving all the relevant sources of bilateral and multilateral experience and knowledge, in order to support the reforms and aid the Soviet Union's integration in the world economy.

[Spiridonov] Britain has to some extent a special attitude toward European integration, which differs significantly from the viewpoint of the majority of its EC partners. Why is that, and what kind of Europe does Britain see in the 21st century?

[Hurd] Britain's position does not differ from the position of our partners. We want to work together in the community on problems which are best tackled together rather than individually. The community is based on two principles. First, it is voluntary: countries are members because they want to be members. Second, it is democratic, so it develops in accordance with consent among all the member countries and their peoples. These two principles will enable it to expand, develop, and enter the 21st century with the same kind of success that have marked the first 34 years of its existence.

[Spiridonov] Judging by reports in the British press, political circles in your country, including those at the highest government level, are closely following the development of events in the Soviet Union and East European countries. Representatives of Western governments, including the British Cabinet, have repeatedly voiced support for perestroyka and a willingness to expand cooperation with the Soviet Union, particularly in the economic sphere. But the fact is that British businessmen, although they are perfectly aware of the Soviet market's potential, are in no hurry to "conquer it." What are the reasons for this and what, in your view, should London and Moscow do to strengthen this cooperation?

[Hurd] The United Kingdom has been a major trading partner of the USSR for a long time. The Soviet market offers enormous potential for British companies, but the latent potential of the Soviet economy suggests that we will be able to do much more after the economic transformations. In short, there are many companies interested in commercial activities, as evidenced by the participation of around 200 companies in the work of the 1 July Confederation of British Industry conference on trade with the Soviet Union. But although over 100 million pounds sterling are owed to British companies and many debt payments are more than one year overdue, I can well appreciate why some companies may regard the USSR as a dangerous market at the moment. [sentence as published] In order to attract Western capital the Soviet Union has to create a clear juridical framework, pay off the debts, and restore its former impeccable reputation.

[Spiridonov] The Soviet Union is well aware that Britian played an important part in the war in the Persian Gulf and vis-a-vis the Kurdish problem. The Soviet Union also participated in the settlement of the conflict, although in a somewhat different way from that of the Western countries. What can you say about the role of Soviet diplomacy during the conflict, and what, in your view, will the Soviet Union's role be in future efforts to settle Near East problems?

[Hurd] The degree of unity demonstrated by the international community in its resolve to make Saddam Husayn leave Kuwait was the key factor in the settlement of the conflict in the Persian Gulf. As a permanent member of the Security Council the Soviet Union played a significant role in shaping the world community's response. The Soviet Union will play a similarly important role in solving other Near East problems that currently figure strongly on the international agenda, to wit: efforts to promote a resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, the settlement of problems that have arisen in the wake of the Iraqi aggression against Kuwait, in particular the question of its mass destruction weapons and missiles, and also measures to prevent the proliferation of weapons in the region. We are hoping for close and fruitful cooperation with the Soviet Union in these areas. We are also very grateful for the generaous assistance given by the Soviet Union to two British citizens held in Iraq.

Bessmertnykh Letter to Austria's Mock on SFRY

AU1507113891 Vienna PROFIL in German
15 Jul 91 pp 10-11

["Excerpts" of letter from Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh to Austrian Foreign Minister Alois Mock on 5 July]

[Text] Dear Mr. Minister: For several days now, the world public and politicians have closely followed events in Yugoslavia. Regrettably, these events are becoming increasingly dramatic and are probably reaching a critical phase. My sense of responsibility and my concern about the fact that no tangible progress has been made regarding a solution to Yugoslavia's internal crisis have caused me to convey to you some considerations in this respect.

In its post-war form, Yugoslavia is a respected, generally recognized, and influential member of the European states and the international community, an organic, integral part of the international structures. Being an active participant in the CSCE process, and being a member and holding the presidency of the movement of non-aligned states, Yugoslavia has played an important role during all these years in increasing stability and confidence on our continent and in the whole world.

All the respect for the right to self-determination of the SFRY peoples—and the other peoples—the use of this right, including consideration of a whole tangle of deeply-rooted interethnic, territorial contradictions in the region, must not lead to the split or "atomization" of individual states or of Europe. We must not forget that the prospect of the disintegration of Yugoslavia would have the most serious consequences for the situation in the Balkans and in Europe. The failure now to stop the attempts by internal and outside forces to fan the internal Yugoslav crisis would mean to show indulgence for the development of conditions allowing the re- emergence of a situation that we know well from the time between the end of the last century and the beginning of this century.

Your country, which has been Yugoslavia's neighbor for many centuries, knows the ups and downs of history well, and knows how dangerous it is to permit the development of any form of conflict. Undoubtedly, the situation that is now developing in the region requires all of us to show a high degree of responsibility, to mobilize efforts for deblocking the situation, and to rule out every possibility of outside interference in Yugoslavia's affairs.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that the countries bordering on Yugoslavia bear particular responsibility for ensuring peace and stability in the region. It is very important in this situation to be able to resist temptation—even though it may have old historic roots—and not to let oneself be influenced by those who do not look forward but look back and are not guided by considerations of a united Europe, but are inspired by nostalgic memories of the former structures in the Balkans, and in doing so, forget the region's unfortunate role as the European powder-keg. I am afraid not all of Yugoslavia's neighbors have resisted temptation and demonstrated their maturity at this responsible moment. It is known that during the months preceding the events in Yugoslavia, weapons were supplied to this country, with its legitimate government being bypassed; in addition, meaningful overtures were made to the supporters of the SFRY's disintegration. There were many other things. Now that the situation has been dangerously aggravated, it is very important to pursue a course that is aimed at preserving Yugoslavia's unity and territorial integrity, and to advocate the idea that the Yugoslav peoples solve their problems themselves. We continue to favor settling all problems and restoring normalcy in the country by way of peaceful dialogue within a constitutional framework, with the friendly support of other CSCE members, to the extent that and in a form that are acceptable to the Yugoslav authorities. At the same time, higher interests require that any attempt to interfere in the SFRY's internal affairs, and to internationalize its internal problems as a means to disintegrate Yugoslavia be ruled out. (...)

The Soviet Union hopes that in this situation, the policy of the countries bordering Yugoslavia will be balanced and wise, and will demonstrate maturity. The new situation in the world and the new way of thinking can only be preserved and gain ground, if it is possible to abandon former political cliches and habits, and to develop a high degree of responsibility and concern about the consolidation and development of the all-European process in the spirit of the Paris charter for the new Europe. This Europe can only become a reality if every country, irrespective of whether it consists of a single nationality or is multinational (...), can feel secure and knows that no one is trying to violate its unity, territorial integrity, and right to continue the development that history has traced out.

Mr. Minister, these are—briefly—my conclusions and assessments regarding the events in and around Yugoslavia. I hope you will be able to share them and support them.

Government to Sign Friendship Treaty With Greece

OW1207081291 Moscow INTERFAX in English
1200 GMT 11 Jul 91

["Diplomatic Panorama" report by M. Mayorov, T. Porsinev; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Greece will be yet another European country to sign a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with the Soviet Union after France, Italy, Germany, Romania and Spain. The treaty will reflect new realitis in Europe. We have been told at the 3rd European Department of the Soviet Foreign Ministry that most probably next week it will be announced in Moscow and Athens about a visit to the USSR by the Greek Prime Minister Konstatinos Mitsotakis. The treaty, unprecedented in the history of Soviet-Greek relations, which was initialled last April during the visit to Athens by the Soviet Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh, is expected to be signed in Moscow.

Since the fall of the Junta in 1974 this will be a third visit to the USSR by a Greek Premier. The main theme of talks between Gorbachev and Mitsotakis is not yet clear. Yugoslavia may upstage any other subject, even bearing on the Mediterranean region which is always prominent in Soviet-Greek contacts on all levels. Both Moscow and Athens are in favour of holding a conference on security and cooperation among Mediterranean countries to spread the Helsinki principles on to this region.

They expect at the Soviet Foreign Ministry that the Soviet-Greek summit may also resolve some trade and economic problems. The Soviet Union stakes on large and long-term investments projects. One of such may be alumina production in Greece with supplies to the Soviet Union. Another project is a gas pipe-line to Athens from the Bulgarian border for supplying natural gas from the Soviet Union.

Belgian Ground Forces Chief of Staff Visits

PM1107123191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Visit to Moscow"]

[Text] Lieutenant General Zh. Beren [name as transliterated], chief of staff of the Belgian Ground Forces, arrived on a visit to the Soviet Union 2 July.

The guest was met at the airport by Army General V.I. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, and other officials.

Lt. Gen. Zh. Beren, chief of staff of the Belgian Ground Forces, who is visiting the Soviet Union, was received by Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minster, 3 July. There was a discussion of issues of mutual interest.

Lt. Gen. Zh. Beren met with Army General V.I. Varennikov, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister.

The Belgian guest visited the Armored Troops Military School and familiarized himself with its training and material base and the organization of the training process.

Soviet Ships on Courtesy Call in Helsinki

PM1107105591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by S. Medvedev, V. Bogatkin, identified by caption, from Helsinki]

[Text] [Medvedev] Passing the legendary gray Sveaborg [Suomenlinna], the training ship Smolnyy and the oceanographic research vessel Ivan Kruzenshtern docked at one of Helsinki's central quays, literally 200 meters from the Presidential Palace. And from that moment onward, they were the focus of the Finnish capital inhabitants' attention.

After meetings with the Mayor of Helsinki, the commander of the Finnish Navy, and other officials, Vice Admiral Selivanov, commander of the detachment of ships, laid flowers at the graves of Presidents Kekkonen and Paasikivi and at the Heroes' Cross, which is what the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier is called here.

Our seamen also visited Cape Hanko where they honored the memory of the heroes of the defense of the Soviet naval base which was located here in 1941. Twenty thousand of our compatriots are buried beneath these stones.

Then the first landing force entered Helsinki. It was a musical force. The naval orchestra took up positions at a popular leisure spot in the Finnish capital, the Esplanade Park. And without exaggeration, it won the hearts of a large audience with its first concert. Almost all the members of the ships' crews numbering 500 people—Nakhimov School cadets—acted as guides. And in the evening they all attended and took part in an improvised concert given for the seamen by the inhabitants of Helsinki.

[Vice Admiral V. Selivanov, commander of the detachment, identified by caption] At the request of the Finnish population and the Finnish official representatives, we are showing them everything, we are showing them how we live, we demonstrate our combat training and all our other activities which are typical of both this ship and the Ivan Kruzenshtern oceanographic vessel.

[Medvedev] Tomorrow the Soviet naval ships will set course for Kronshtadt.

Further Reportage on Gonzalez Visit to Moscow

LD1007112591 Madrid RNE-1 Radio Network in Spanish 1800 GMT 9 Jul 91

[Report from special correspondent in Moscow Maria Jesus Chao]

[Excerpt] Prime Minister Felipe Gonzalez, and his wife, Carmen Romero, are on their way back to Spain following their official two-day visit to Moscow. The good current state of Hispano-Soviet relations was present throughout the visit, which has served to set in motion the juridical framework to promote bilateral relations. At the joint news conference to assess the outcome of these two days of work Prime Minister Gonzalez stressed the opportuneness of the visit because of the situation both in the USSR and internationally, a new era, said Gonzalez, which is not free from conflicts, which we have to try to make as few as possible. In this context the process taking place in the Soviet Union has to be observed with attention because it affects us all. In the opinion of Prime Minister Gonzalez this process is positive and peaceful:

[Begin Gonzalez recording] Overall I think that the impressive process of reform taking place in the Soviet Union has so far developed in a general climate, which in my opinion is very positive and of a substantially peaceful nature. [end recording]

This is the support of the Spanish Govenment for the Soviet transformation being promoted by Gorbachev, support which has been reaffirmed by this visit and by the signing of a treaty of friendship and cooperation which will shortly establish direct mechanisms of consultation in the event of conflict, an immediate line of communication between Felipe Gonzalez and Mikhail Gorbachev and the institutionalization of annual talks at the highest level. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev 5 June Speech for Norwegian King

Moscow TASS International Service in Russian
2120 GMT 5 Jun 91

[Excerpts] Oslo, 5 Jun (TASS)—The USSR president and his wife paid a visit to King Herald and Queen Sonja on the evening of 5 June. On behalf of the king and queen of Norway, dinner was given in honor of M.S. Gorbachev and R.M. Gorbacheva, at which the king of Norway and the USSR president exchanged speeches. [passage omitted: text of King Harald V's speech]

Speech of M.S. Gorbachev

Your Majesties! Raisa Maksimovna and I are sincerely grateful to you for an invitation to the royal palace, for your friendliness and straightforwardness and your kind wishes. In this we see an important symbol of goodneighborliness in interstate relations.

Your majesties,

Ladies and gentlemen: I have flown in to Oslo for just one day. But it has turned out to be rich in impressions, observations, and thought-provoking. At the official ceremony in the town hall, I once more experienced how necessary solidarity, understanding, and support are for a man, for a politician. These qualities which have long been valued in everyday life are now becoming a condition for world progress and the effectiveness of interstate relations, and an element of international security.

Several hours ago in my Nobel lecture I spoke about my country. It is going though a stormy, difficult time. But this is also a process which is cleansing and making society healthy—something similar to a critical turning point in the course of a severe illness. The point of our perestroyka is to reform and revive a great state and to return it on new foundations to the bosom of world civilization. The most complex thing in this process is not even the economy, but psychology, the breaking of views of oneself, habits and the attitude, to labor, the law, norms of society, and not last, to the outside world, which have been distorted by living conditions. A new and heartening view of society is already gradually taking shape. The rapid flow of changes is throwing up spray, frothing spume, and forming a dirty scum. Many people in our country and abroad are interpreting this with bitterness as the genuine fruits of perestroyka and succumbing to pessimism, if not to panic. But these are its inevitable waste products and not the essence of the profound processes of transformation which it has spawned.

In recent weeks, a certain calm in society, signs of agreement in political life and a sobering up from an excess of the oxygen of freedom, which literally tore the link between rights and obligations, are increasingly showing the main layer of the people's common sense, which will enable us to overcome the crisis and to proceed more confidently along the reform path, to set up a new union. And, of course, it would be a great help to us, especially now, if we could rely on effective international solidarity.

Soviet-Norwegian mutual understanding is an inalienable part of the international medium which is necessaty for the success of perestroyka. In the post-war period our relations have taken shape, as they say, in various ways. There has been a bit of everything. But, after all, for over a thousand years the destinies of our peoples have become strangely intertwined. And this is not only a historical reality. Immutable in our national tradition and in our culture are profound respect for and interest in the Norwegians, and a sense that there are no reasons for alienation, let alone enmity, that everything bad which has appeared between us has been alien, accidental, and should be moved aside, especially now in an atmosphere of the deideologization of international relations. There have been and may be misunderstandings, shortcomings, disputed problems, even errors. These are circumstances which make it impossible to settle this or that question at a given moment. But let's not suspect each other of bad intentions. In the final analysis, everything is resolvable in an atmosphere of dialogue.

The world is entering a new, peaceful period. And the power of the state, its authority and standing in the international community, will be determined to an increasing extent not by the dimensions or numbers of its army, but by the level of its civilization, its adherence to common human values, the freedom and prosperity of its people, and its ability to preserve and enrich its originality not at the expense of others, but in mutually advantageous honest cooperation with them. Norway is already among such—thus far few—states.

One more characteristic of its civilization is the situation of women, their role is all spheres of the country's life. An example of this is Prime Minister Mrs Gro Harlem Brundtland, herself, known in the whole world, an eminent politician and individual. Our negotiations have been very frank and substantive, and, I consider, successful. I have noted for myself that the "chill" in Soviet-Norwegian relations has thawed a little. I think that they have a good future. As we overcome the crisis period in our development they will gather both dynamism and scale.

I agree with Mrs Harlem Brundtland: Having buried the "Cold War," we have to warm up the pan-European home. Expanding interaction between the USSR and Norway on new foundations for the resolution of political and economic problems of the north of Europe, and for the opening up and ecological protection of the Arctic, we, I hope, will increase our joint original contribution to the great pan-European cause.

Once more, thank you for your reception and your hospitality on the soil of Norway. We wish it prosperity, and wellbeing to its people.

To the health of their majesties, to Soviet-Norwegian mutual understanding and cooperation!

Latin America & Caribbean

Commentator on Relations With Paraguay

PY1207143891 Moscow Radio Moscow in Spanish to Latin America 2300 GMT 11 Jul 91

[Commentary by Valentin Mashkin]

[Text] I do not know what do you think, dear listeners, about relations between the Soviet Union and other countries. I personally think that the Latin American continent feels ever closer to the Soviet Union. Recently there has been rumor in the Soviet Union about the establishment of diplomatic relations with Paraguay. Radio Moscow commentator Valentin Mashkin voices his opinion on this matter.

[Begin Mashkin recording] During an interview with the news agency NOVOSTI, Paraguayan Foreign Minister Alexis Frutos said that Paraguay could establish diplomatic relations before the end of 1991. The minister said that there is no problem to prevent such relations.

I want to draw the attention of our radio listeners to Mr. Frutos' statement that currently there is no problem in establishing such relations. I want to say that there were problems before. Yes, there were, not only from Paraguay but also from the USSR. For the Soviet Union, the major problem was in part the repulsive Stroessnerist's regime. I say just in part, because in its attempt to maintain good relations with Latin America, the Soviet Union has very often maintained such relations with governments which do not deserve much respect. What was then the main problem then? The division in the world at that time was the main reason against relations between the USSR and Paraguay. In the Soviet Union there have been both the confrontations between the two blocs: the east and the west [words indistinct] but also with the third world. For example, Panama decided to refrain from maintaining relations with the USSR so as not to bother the United States. The Soviet Union, in turn, did not advocate the establishment of broad relations with Honduras, an old base that supported the contras during the years of the U.S. sordid war against Nicaragua. Times have luckily changed for better. The stabilization of U.S.-Soviet relations have contribute to improving the world political atmosphere. These (?changes) were promptly reflected in Soviet-Latin American links. Beginning [word indistinct] 1990, diplomatic relations were established or resumed with Panama, Chile, Honduras, Guatemala and the Dominican Republic. Now is the turn of Paraguay. Thus all Latin American Countries will now have links with Moscow. [end recording]

Chilean President Invites Gorbachev To Visit

OW1207081191 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1200 GMT 11 Jul 91

[From the "Diplomatic Panorama"; transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The Soviet President has indeed been invited by Chilean President Patricio Aylwin to visit that country Soviet Foreign Ministry officials told DP'S [Diplomatic Panorama's] reporter, yet they have found it hard to say when the visit could take place. The invitation was handed to Mikhail Gorbachev during the visit to Moscow of Chile's Minister for the Economy Carlos Ominami late last month, diplomats of the Latin American department of the Foreign Ministry confirmed. Yet the matter has been agreed upon in principle, while the concrete date of the visit will apparently be set through diplomatic channels later. Most likely Mikhail Gorbachev's trip to Latin America will be preceded by Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's tour of the continent before the turn of the year.

Foreign Ministry officials said the Soviet policy towards Chile at the moment can be described as devoid of ideological stereotypes. Diplomatic relations between the two sides were resumed on March 11 of 1990—the day when the civilian administration headed by Aylwin took office. The visit to this country of Chilean Minister for the Economy Mr Ominami ended in the signing of a trading agreement which both sides hope will allow with time to restore full-scale economic cooperation between the two sides.

The two countries are intent on studying each other's experience in market reforms. The Soviet interest in the matter is specifically highlighted due to the notable advances the Chilean economy made in the years of the military regime, when a progamme was put into operation worked out by excerpts from the so-called "Chilean school". In the military sphere relations are far from normal, one Soviet Foreign Ministry official said, yet "neither side rules out the possibility of dialogue".

El Salvador Denies Entry to Correspondent

LD1407223891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2027 GMT 14 Jul 91

[Text] Managua, 14 Jul (TASS)—The Salvadoran authorities have banned the entry into the country of a Soviet journalist who arrived in San Salvador on Saturday from Nicaragua to report the meeting of Central American heads of state.

The immigration service of El Salvador explained its strange decision by the fact that the official visa was allegedly issued to TASS correspondent Yuriy Dmitriyev "without the knowledge of the government of Alfredo Cristiani". After a 12-hour stay at the airport under the surveillance of armed guards the sole representative of the Soviet press at the regional summit was put on board an aircraft flying back to Nicaragua.

The authorities in San Salvador refused to take responsibility for the material losses of TASS occasioned by the disruption of the trip to El Salvador by the agency's correspondent. Nevertheless the TASS office in Managua intends to seek reimbursement of the loss from El Salvador's consul general in Nicaragua who issued an official entry visa to the Soviet correspondent on 20 June.

Political actions of this kind in restricting the access of foreign mass information media to the country clearly run counter to the statements of the El Salvadoran authorities about the existence of democracy in El Salvador.

Aldana, Cuban Delegation End Moscow Visit 3 Jul

PM1207105191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A meeting was held between P.K. Luchinskiy, O.S. Shenin, V.A. Kuptsov, and V.M. Falin, and a Communist Party of Cuba delegation which was in Moscow at the CPSU Central Committee's invitation and is headed by C. Aldana, member of the Central Committee Secretariat.

The participants at the meeting briefed each other on the state of affairs in their countries and on problems currently being resolved by the CPSU and the Communist Party of Cuba. Stress was laid on the mutual desire to strengthen the traditional relations of friendship and cooperation between the two parties and peoples.

The delegation headed by C. Aldana left for home 3 July.

Soviet Warships Sailing Through Sargasso Sea

PM1207122991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[Radio report by Captain First Class A. Pilipchuk from on board the guided-missile cruiser Marshal Ustinov under the rubric "The Fleet on Distant Voyages": "In the Bermuda Triangle"]

[Excerpt] The Atlantic Ocean—Recently certain mass media have returned to the apparently forgotten topic of the Bermuda Triangle. It became a kind of geometric danger symbol for shipping in the Sargasso Sea area and aircraft overflying it. In the past the press has published numerous spine-chilling reports on ships and aircraft which had disappeared without trace here and of ships' crews who, down to the last man, suffered a mysterious death. A detachment of warships from the Northern Fleet under the flag of Admiral F. Gromov, commander of the Northern Fleet, comprising the guided-missile cruiser Marshal Ustinov, the large antisubmarine warfare ship Simferopol, and the tanker Dnestr, is currently sailing through the northern Sargasso Sea. [passage omitted].

Supreme Soviet

Deputies Debate Nishanov Union Treaty Report

PM1507153391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 Second Edition pp 1-2

[Report by M. Buzhkevich, O. Losoto, and V. Shirokov: "For the Sake of the Present and the Future. USSR Supreme Soviet Starts Discussing Union Treaty"]

[Excerpts] Yesterday's USSR Supreme Soviet sitting was undoubtedly one of the most important. The parliamentarians started discussing the draft Treaty on the Union of Sovereign States. The intensive creative work by representatives of the Union republics and of the Preparatory Committee set up by decision of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies has lasted more than a year. [passage omitted]

After R. Nishanov's report the debate started. The debate was heated, contrary to the predictions made by certain deputies that parliament's opinion would not be of interest to the authors of the draft "Treaty on the Union of Sovereign States" and that therefore the discussion would be sluggish. The debate was opened by Yu. Kalmykov, chairman of parliament's Committee for Legislation and Law and Order. He said that, in the opinion of his colleagues who had given a generally positive reception to the document, the question of signing the new Union treaty can be raised. However, before this happens it will need a number of substantive changes, amendments, and clarifications.

We all hoped that the new treaty, Yu. Kalmykov said, would put a stop to the notorious "war of laws." Yet, on the basis of the proposed text of the draft, one can even envisage an intensification of that war. It is a question of Article 11, under which the republics can unilaterally suspend Union laws on their territories if these laws do not correspond with their own constitutions and laws. The center has the same right. All this will only disrupt the harmony between components of the federation. There is a solution. If a republic protests a Union law it is necessary to set up a conciliation commission. If this commission is unable to settle the conflict the Constitutional Court will be brought in. Its decisions will be final.

Moreover, according to Yu. Kalmykov, we need to clearly define which legislation will be worked out by the USSR Supreme Soviet. The treaty should provide a clear list. This will make the acts of legislation adopted by the country's parliament indisputable and will allow republics to develop their own laws in full accordance with the legal demands and interests of other republics and the entire Union.

His last comment related to Union property. It is not hard to conclude from Article 8 of the draft treaty that no such property is envisaged. How can a sovereign state exist—and, after all, that is what is written in the chapter on the treaty's main principles: the Union of Soviet Sovereign Republics is a sovereign federative democratic state—how can a sovereign state exist when it has no economic basis for sovereignty?

A. Boyko, deputy chairman of the parliamentary Committee for Economic Reform, who then spoke, said that the Union as a state and as an integrated economic, social, and, if you like, living space is our supreme asset and should not be lost under any circumstances. Its destruction will have terrible repercussions, which we are already experiencing. And one would very much like certain political "businessmen" to realize this.

The republics' desire to be sovereign is a reality of the present day, and we have to take account of it. However much we may criticize or disagree with certain norms and provisions of the draft Union Treaty, nonetheless there is no alternative to it today. We must go down the road of the well-known "nine plus one" agreement and the proposed draft treaty. In my view, only one thing remains: to recognize, respect, and cherish this document. The fact that it needs to be improved in order to promote in every possible way the strengthening of the still very shaky agreement reached today is another matter.

Our committee, A. Boyko continued, is very concerned about the problems of preserving a single economic space, which is today under threat. The draft treaty contains wholly acceptable norms on a unified monetary system, financial and credit policy, a unified prices policy, unified customs, a banking system, and so forth. This should be welcomed.

As a Ukrainian, he is very concerned about the position of that republic's leaders. On the one hand, they would seem to be in favor of the Union, since they are very well aware that in the referendum the people quite definitely advocated the Union as a federal state. But, on the other hand, everything is being done in such a way as to ensure that the federation becomes a confederation, virtually an out-and-out community of nations. In the current situation the Supreme Soviet's position should be clear: Despite the faults in the draft, it should be approved and its earliest possible signing promoted in every possible way.

S. Alekseyev, chairman of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, described the draft new Union Treaty as the most important legal document in the past few years. It reinforces the creation of a rule-of-law state. The treaty will form the basis of the country's future constitution. The committee headed by S. Alekseyev produced its conclusion on the draft treaty and distributed it to deputies. In particular, it notes that there were no violations of the USSR Constitution or republic constitutions and no infringements of the powers of the top Union and republic organs in the organization of work on the document.

Commenting on individual sections and articles of the draft treaty, S. Alekseyev drew attention to the fact that the desire of certain republics to abolish federal taxes deprives the Union of a financial base and thereby calls its very existence into question. The state cannot live on the basis of somebody's contributions. Supporting Yu. Kalmykov's fears about the possible continuation of the "war of laws," he said that multiple power centers [mnogovlastiye] are destroying the state. It is for this reason that a bloodless civil war has virtually begun. In conclusion, the speaker proposed setting up a specific organ to interpret laws, which will help prevent subjectivism as regards their implementation.

N. Pivovarov, chairman of the parliamentary Committee for State Building, took the floor. He was dissatisfied about the wording of the new Union treaty. It contains many generalities, norms are not clearly defined, the powers of the Union are vaguely outlined, and so forth. But we have to be realistic, N. Pivovarov believes. The document is based on an agreement among all the republics. This is an important step toward understanding the shared destiny of the peoples living in our country. And that is why, when you encounter claims that Supreme Soviet may not even support the draft new Union treaty, you wonder what would happen then.

The speaker noted that the principle of the full authority of the soviets as traditionally understood is currently undergoing substantive changes. This is largely being promoted by the establishment of presidential rule both in the Union and in most republics. Eight republics, four former autonomous regions, and one national okrug have removed the word "Soviet" from their names. In Moldova there is a parliament instead of a Supreme Soviet, in the Nakhichevan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] there is a Supreme Majlis. The Azerbaijani president is entitled to suspend local soviets until the question of their disbandment is decided by the Supreme Soviet. The Kyrgyz and Azerbaijani presidents can fire the leaders of oblast, rayon, and city soviets. Soviets at all levels again have to fight for their place in this hierarchy. I think that the new types of soviets too should correspond with the strengthening executive. Incidentally, the strengthening of the executive is being accompanied by a great deal of diversity. There are mayors, vice mayors, city governments, administrations, prefects, and plenipotentiaries. Attempts by anyone to dictate to anyone are more dangerous than ever now.

In article 21 of the draft Union Treaty, which states that Moscow is the capital of the USSR, it would be logical to add that the status of capital of the USSR is determined by USSR law. What are the arguments? As is well known, there is the sphere of social relations, which requires regulation by the law. Relations between the city and the Union authorities, and with components of the Union Treaty—that is, sovereign republics—as well as relations between the USSR and the Russian Federation fall into this category. All this needs to be reflected in a special law.

Deputy D. Kugultinov recalled that the quality of a people is determined not by its size but by the breadth of its spirit and culture. And in terms of this infinite breadth all peoples are equal. I thank destiny that my people found itself on Russian territory, where the Great October Revolution—which we are now for some reason shamefully and faint-heartedly trying to overlook—took place. We should not overlook it. This revolution allowed us all to regard ourselves as identical. And what I like most about the Union Treaty is that it is based on the equality of all the peoples. That suits all of us. From the standpoint of small peoples the treaty is a vital necessity for us today. It will allow people to work. Only if all of us work will we get out of the crisis. D. Kugultinov called on deputies to approve the draft treaty.

Yu. Blokhin spoke from a different standpoint on the draft treaty. Expressing the opinion of the "Soyuz" deputies' group, he did not support the proposal to push for the treaty to be signed. In his opinion, the price of the inaccuracies and contradictions contained in the document is already too high. The shortcomings in the treaty are a result of the fact that to all intents and purposes the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and USSR Supreme Soviet were not involved in drawing it up. The many proposals put forward by deputies during the preliminary discussion of the document were ignored, as were the results of the all-Union referendum. BUT the draft "Novo-Ogarevo" treaty implements the zero-option concept. There is no united Union state, but there are a number of independent states whose presidents unexpectedly agreed to unite. A unilateral, parochial approach prevailed, annulling the USSR Supreme Soviet's more than two years of legislative activity, and the content of the treaty has been transformed in the direction of a confederal state setup. Indeed, can we really talk about a federal state system if it lacks a unified judicial system, if there is no system of prosecutorial oversight or law-enforcement organs, or if there is no provision for a unified system of vertically integrated executive organs? The Union's supreme authority virtually lacks any economic base. Even such important sectors as power generation, transportation, and the defense industry are not under its exclusive jurisdiction.

The implementation of the concept of a federal structure for the USSR will lead to an exacerbation of interethnic confrontation and conflicts, and the emergence of local wars over what people call their "own territories." Yu. Blokhin believes that the desire of a number of state formations and territories populated by ethnic minorities to secede from certain republics will increase.

After dinner the debates on the draft Union Treaty continued.

Deputy I. Saydakhmedov said that Uzbekistan was one of the first to advocate signing the treaty. It is of immense importance not only for the fate of our country's peoples but for the fate of the world community. It is perplexing, the speaker noted, that even before the draft document was published some of the mass media started an unbridled campaign against it, launching attacks on republic leaders and the USSR president, who had signed the "nine plus one" statement. The position of these forces has no connection with state interests. The new Union Treaty is not a road into the unknown or an attempt to destroy the Union, it is a struggle for the rights lost during the years of the administrative-edict system, it is a return to the Leninist idea of a union of sovereign states. Touching on the essence of the draft itself, the speaker made a number of specific comments and proposals.

N. Gritsenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Commission for Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy, said that in the year of the work on the draft Union Treaty the document has been substantially altered and deepened. A great deal of work has been done to bring positions closer together and clarify them. The draft document now basically accords with the interests and sovereignty of the states which will be the components of the future treaty. It needs to be signed without delay. Life simply will not wait. While there is no treaty human rights are being violated more and more. For instance, this year it is forecast that around 12 million people could be looking for work. Most of them will find work one way or another, but 1.5 million people could be left unemployed. That is why we need to implement coordinated all-Union employment programs and other joint measures. So far only five republics have adopted laws on employment. The same is true of the right to social welfare, which has not yet been backed up with the necessary funds. The foundations of social policy should be formulated more clearly in the treaty. We need to accelerate the finalization and signing of the document.

Against the backdrop of the somewhat dry and businesslike speeches of the men, the comments from the rostrum by women deputies met with a warm wave of emotion. Thus, I. Andreyeva spoke passionately about the fact that Union Treaty is a kind of guarantee against the return of totalitarianism. The Union should be the guarantor of democracy. Unfortunately, the text of the treaty needs major editing. Its unevenness needs to be sorted out. The text of the treaty should be triumphant.

She was vigorously supported by Deputy Yu. Sokolova. She said that, discussing the Union treaty, the country's parliamentarians have been talking about it as if it were a very personal document, since it affects the personal destiny of everyone. Our families are now facing a lot that is changing and vague. The conclusion of the Union Treaty will make it possible to return some stability and reliability to life and bring back our faith in the future. That is largely why the text of the treaty should be clear, simple, and triumphant. It should be a treaty for people of honor who give their word and keep it.

People's Deputies M. Rakhmanova, G. Tarazevich, L. Sharin, A. Sebentsov, M. Pashaly, Yu. Sharipov, U. Orozova, V. Tetenov, and others also spoke at yesterday's sitting.

The session will continue tomorrow.

Nishanov Answers Questions on Union Treaty

LD1407093891 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 2310 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Council of Nationalities Chairman Rafik Nishanov answers questions at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 12 July; from the "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] The fifth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet ended its work today. At the concluding meeting deputies continued their discussion of the draft Union treaty. Over the two days 45 deputies took part in the debate—peoples of various nationalities, representatives of 17 committees and commissions and of 10 deputies' groups. There were tumultuous discussions. An absolute majority, having expressed observations on the draft, declared themselves in favor of its being signed as soon as possible. The main points on which attention needs to be focussed are issues concerning improving economic interaction and defining more clearly the division of powers between the republics and the center, as well as insuring rights for autonomous formations and minority peoples.

The debate was wound up by Deputy Nishanov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities. He noted the broad range of opinions which emerged in the course of the discussion, and stressed that everyone of them is imbued with concern for the unity and might of the union. The deputy gave an assurance that all the observations and suggestions will be drawn together and taken into account in the finalizing of the treaty.

[Nishanov] Now I would like to answer some questions. Deputy Comrade Alfreds Petrovich Rubiks asks: In your report at the session you made an appeal to leaders of Ukraine to speed up their examination of the draft treaty for the new union. I consider there was justification for such an appeal, but why did you not make such an appeal to those republics which have declined even to examine the draft union treaty? Under Article 113 of the USSR Constitution, such an appeal would have been fully in keeping with the functions of the Soviet of Nationalities and of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

I wholly support Comrade Rubik's point. The only reason I did not make such an appeal yesterday was because today I should like to offer a small document for your attention. This document is a draft appeal to the Supreme Soviets of Armenia, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova and Estonia and their people's deputies at all levels. [passage omitted]

Comrade Podziruk asks this question: The draft union treaty disturbs the future of the Armed Forces and defense. After the signing of the treaty by the nine, does not the fate of the groups of forces in the countries of East Europe await the units stationed in the six other republics? What stipulations, in your view need to be made in this regard before the signing of the treaty and afterwards.

This is a very serious question, and the answer is that the draft union treaty envisages the existence of common unified armed forces for the country and this has to do with the sphere of the union's exclusive competence. The territory of the Soviet Union is unified and the situation regarding the East European countries does not apply to the troops or units stationed in the republics of the Soviet Union.

Comrade Shamikhin asks that the following be explained: Article three in the draft treaty states that the territory of the Union consists of the territories of all the states forming it. Does this mean that there will be a revision of the borders of our country which were established in accordance with the outcome of the war?

Let me answer firmly: No, it does not mean that. Territorial integrity will be preserved and any republic or state that wishes to secede from the Soviet Union will do so only on the basis of the constitution and only on the basis of the law on secession from the USSR. There is no other way. We shall not accept any ultimatums.

Deputy Sukhov is interested in the following question: Our Leonid Ivanovich seems to have heard on television, in a program some comments by Russian Television which said that, allegedly, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had said somewhere that the union parliament has no more than half a year to continue its work. [noises in audience, voices "yes"]. As far as I know, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has never said such words. The point of view of the USSR president and of the leaders of the union republics, on this issue, is formulated in the well-known joint declaration Nine plus One, and it consists in the following: After signing the Union treaty, within six months, the new constitution of the USSR should be drafted. And in my report yesterday I told you that the Supreme Soviet and the Constitutional Commission will present the new constitution of the USSR to the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. And the congress will decide for itself whether to adopt the constitution or to present it for the referendum of the whole people. After the constitution has been adopted, the same congress and the same USSR Supreme Soviet will be working out the new electoral system. Then, under the guidance of the present Supreme Soviet, new plenipotentiary representatives, only then will the issue of handing power over to them arise. So far, we are acting within a single state, under a single constitution; we have laws of our own, and nobody, except the Soviet people, has a right to disband either the Supreme Soviet or the Congress of People's Deputies. I am asking you to work calmly, creatively and in full accordance with the wishes of the Soviet people.

[Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov] Comrades, I would like to add. We had a meeting of the presidium of the Supreme Soviet, on the 9th. Mikhail Sergevich was not present at the meeting. The meeting was devoted to our work. And, therefore, the reference in—is it VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA [Evening News] which talks about it—from competent sources, that at the meeting of the Supreme Soviet presidium, Gorbachev said that the country's Supreme Soviet has half a year to live, the president was not present at the meeting, and this issue was not discussed at all. This is by way of comment on how objective our press is.

[Nishanov] Well, thank you for this comment...[noise in audience]

[Lukyanov] Not the whole of it, of course, but some of the press...

[Announcer] The Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution in which it supports the draft union treaty on the whole and considers its signing possible after final touches have been added and agreement between the republics has been reached.

Soyuz Group To Demand Vote on Union Treaty

LD1507155891 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow July 15 TASS—The leaders of the Soyuz parliamentary group today confirmed their intention at a news conference to demand that the draft Union treaty be approved by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies (full parliament).

Last week, the Soyuz group failed to incorporate this demand into a decision by the Supreme Soviet (standing parliament) on the results of a two-day debate on the draft Union treaty.

The decision adopted by parliament notes that the draft Union treaty should be signed at the USSR Congress of People's Deputies but says nothing about the congress's right to approve the document.

Chairman of the standing parliament Anatoliy Lukyanov harshly censured the position taken by the Soyuz group, saying that the congress cannot approve a treaty, since its final approval is the prerogative of republics.

"The restructuring of the USSR is the prerogative of peoples and the bodies of state authority they elect," Lukyanov emphasised.

Soyuz favours the preservation of the federative structure of the USSR and sharply criticises the draft Union treaty, since it has a "confederative nature and will lead to the state's disintegration".

Replying to a TASS question, Soyuz co-chairman Yevgeniy Kogan stressed that "the last say will be said by the congress, and we shall defend our viewpoint at the congress". He accused President Mikhail Gorbachev of conducting a "consistent policy for the country's disintegration".

According to Kogan, Soyuz has collected the required number of legislators' signatures to demand the calling of the congress in compliance with the Constitution and intends to pass a no-confidence vote on the Soviet president.

Chairman of the Soyuz coordination council Yuriy Blokhin also lashed out at Gorbachev for "unilateral concessions to republics" during the talks in Novo-Ogaryovo, which, according to him, will lead to "the abolition of a united federative state".

He emphasised that the Soyuz group is dragging its feet with the calling of the congress, since it wants to become convinced that it will have a required majority to pass its decisions.

During a recent debate at the standing parliament on additional powers to Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, Gorbachev criticised for the first time two Soyuz leaders—Yuriy Blokhin and Viktor Alksnis—for their attempts "to destabilise cooperation" between the centre and the republics.

Resolution on Resources for Harvesting Issued

PM1507114591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution On Additional Measures To Enlist Workers, Students, and Pupils, Along With Transport Resources, for Harvesting and Other Agricultural Work in 1991"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet notes that the steps taken by republic governments and local organs to resolve the whole series of questions of assisting the countryside in 1991 are insufficiently effective. Work to conclude contracts between agricultural, industrial, transport, and other enterprises, establishments, organizations, and educational institutions on the participation of workers, students, and pupils in harvesting and other agricultural work, along with sending transport resources for this work, is being dragged out. The messages and letters which the USSR Supreme Soviet receives attest to the fact that, in a number of cases, enterprises in the agro-industrial complex are facing unviable conditions and are coming under pressure, rendering the conclusion of these contracts economically unprofitable and sometimes even impossible.

In view of the exceptional importance of bringing in the harvest in a timely and qualitative fashion and reducing losses, the USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

That the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, the supreme soviets and governments in the republics be instructed to formulate within the shortest possible time a compensation mechanism to provide incentives encouraging workers, students, and pupils to take part in bringing in the harvest and other agricultural work and also to send transport resources for this work, using as a base the procedure and terms for refund of costs set by the USSR Finance Ministry in 1991 for enterprises and organizations under USSR jurisdiction.

[Signed] A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The Kremlin, Moscow, 6 July 1991.

Antimonopoly Legislation Discussed

PM1207143291 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jul 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[Report from the Kremlin by IZVESTIYA parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy, S. Chugayev: "Supreme Soviet Discusses Union Treaty"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] After attending the ceremonial session of the Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies at which B. Yeltsin took office as the first RSFSR president, the Union parliamentarians began their 10 July plenary session with questions to USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov. Deputy V. Yerokhin inquired whether an answer had been received to his question to S. Anisimov, USSR minister of material resources. A. Lukyanov reported that the Supreme Soviet has received explanations from the minister, which will be conveyed to the member of the Commission on Questions of Privileges and Benefits.

Deputy V. Shapovalenko reminded the chairman that a resolution has yet to be adopted on the information report of the Commission on Questions of Privileges and Benefits, although four days have already passed. A. Lukyanov said that he will not allow passions to become inflamed right at the beginning of the session, and proposed going on to finish the discussion of a question also left unfinished the previous day—on amendments and additions to the USSR Law "On Taxation of Enterprises, Associations, and Organizations." The session participants agreed to this proposal and fairly quickly dealt with this duty.

After that, as was envisaged in the work schedule, the deputies embarked on the second-reading examination of the Law on Restricting Monopolist Activity in the USSR (that is now the name of the draft law on the fundamentals of antimonopoly legislation that was adopted at the first reading). Deputy N. Bobritskiy reported on the work done during the week. He drew his colleagues' attention to the amendments made. The main task of the legal act in question is to restrict and prevent monopolist activity in newly formed structures and not to allow destructive mechanisms to operate at the stage of transition to market relations.

At the evening session it proved possible finally to eliminate all the contentious points that had arisen in the course of the second-reading discussion of the draft Law on Restricting Monopolist Activity in the USSR. One of the stumbling blocks, as was to be expected, was the question of to whom the future antimonopoly committee should be subordinate. In the opinion of the government representative, it should be subordinate to the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. But the vast majority of deputies who spoke on the subject supported the position of those who drafted the law—the USSR antimonopoly committee should come under the jurisdiction of the USSR president and be accountable to the country's parliament. The preponderance of supporters of this thesis proved so obvious that in the event the question of amending this point in the draft law was decided without even being put to the vote.

So yet another law without which the transition to market relations in the economy would be impossible is to come into force in our country.

The USSR Supreme Soviet's work on the package of legislative acts designed to support the country's entry into the market is nearing completion. At the same session the deputies approved, at the first reading, the last draft law from this package—the law on securities and stock exchanges.

Presenting the draft law to members of the Union parliament, USSR Finance Minister V. Orlov pointed out that the main aim of the document is to protect the interests of shareholders, whose numbers will rise in the near future to hundreds of thousands, or even millions. Protection is based on the principle of glasnost. Issuing bodies (the legal entities which pledge themselves to fulfill commitments stemming from the terms of issue of securities) are not entitled to commence the sale of shares or other securities without publication in at least two newspapers of preliminary information on the securities and on the financial position of those who are issuing them, and this information must be complete and absolutely reliable. The draft law makes provision for protecting the securities market from incompetent and unscrupulous participants. It will not be easy to obtain a license to pursue professional activity in securities, as one can see on the basis of the draft law. The requirements are quite tough. They include, perhaps for the first time in Soviet legislation, the principle of property qualifications—a professional participant in the securities market must possess certain assets. This rule is necessary to limit the risk in dealings in securities.

At the same time the state does not take on the role of guarantor on the securities market. The buyer is still taking a risk. But—and this is, we repeat, one of the main aims of the draft law—he should be confident that his possible losses will not be due to incompetence or dishonesty on the part of professional participants in the securities market.

It should be noted that the draft law met with unusually unanimous approval from the deputies, although a good many specific observations were put forward. In the course of the debates the view was repeatedly put forward that this draft law, which offers all working people the right in practice, not just in theory, to become co-owners of the means of production, at last gives these same working people the opportunity to have something more by the end of their lives than a meager state pension, and is for once a real, not merely a theoretical, way of achieving social justice.

The topic of social justice basically dominated the heated debate that broke out in the final stages of the session. A proposal from a group of worker deputies on amendments to an article of the Law on the Dismantling of State Ownership and Privatization that was adopted last week was submitted for the participants' consideration.

The authors of the amendment deem unacceptable the provision of the law that deals with the possibility of carrying out privatization of state enterprises without the consent of the labor collective. Their proposal is that the decision to remove from state ownership or privatize enterprises that are under all-Union ownership should be adopted by the USSR State Property Fund only with the consent of the labor collective.

The difficulty here, let us remind you, was that the Law on the Dismantling of State Ownership and Privatization was adopted by roll-call vote. Furthermore the most heated and prolonged debates were probably those that surrounded the very section that it is proposed to amend. And although, as A. Lukyanov reported, the law has not yet been submitted for the signature of the USSR president, is it right for parliament to revise a decision that has already been adopted? In principle this questions could be considered the central point in a debate that ranged from theoretical discussions of the grounds on which the labor collective may consider itself the owner of the enterprise even before privatization, to the threats and insults against his opponents with which Deputy A. Kryshkin, one of the authors of the amendments, sought to strengthen his case. The opponents' opinion can be expressed briefly—if the proposed amendment is adopted, the law is bound to be ineffective.

Unfortunately it proved impossible to resolve the clash in the most rational way—by a vote. For the umpteenth time, at the end of the evening session there was no quorum.

Deputies Debate Privileges, Benefits

PM1607100391 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 9 Jul 91 p 1

[Report by Robert Minasov under the "Parliamentary Readings" rubric: "Schemers Anxious to Save Face, But Deputies Unequivocally Condemn Them"]

[Text] It can be assumed that A. Lukyanov was faced with a difficult choice. It obviously would have been rash from the point of view of common sense to make last Saturday's evening sitting of the fifth session "secure" from prying eyes and ears. Because the Commission on Questions of Privileges and Benefits had tactically outmaneuvered him by inviting the Soviet and foreign press—which has made extensive use of the material on criminal abuses of all kinds of privileges by a large group of high-ranking officials—to its open hearings on 27 June.

On the other hand, the hearings in parliament—broadcast to an audience of millions—oblige the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet to bring matters to their logical conclusion and make the scroungers and self-seekers personally liable. Whether Anatoliy Ivanovich will want to do this or not is something else. We will have to wait and see what happens.

In any case, he chaired the sitting with dignity and the greatest possible objectivity. True, I felt he nevertheless fudged matters at the end by proposing that the hastily assembled "team" from various committees and commissions be given two months to elaborate and convey the three draft resolutions proposed by the Commission on Questions of Privileges and Benefits.

I hope I am wrong, but I feel sure that Anatoliy Ivanovich is counting on the matter "resolving itself" in the next two months: Some things will be forgotten, some of those who have had their knuckles rapped will conveniently go on well-deserved leave, and others will be punished by being "sent" on diplomatic service to a prosperous Western country. Just as L. Voronin (former first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers) was "sent" to Belgium, for example, and M. Shkabardnya, former USSR Council of Ministers administrator of affairs, to a Scandinavian country to "earn hard currency for a living," as E. Pamfilova, secretary of the Commission on Questions of Privileges and Benefits, stressed in her speech at Saturday's sitting.

The apparatus had not been caught napping: It had actively prepared to neutralize as far as possible the impact of the revealing report delivered by Commission Deputy Chairman N. Kozyrev, which had been distributed among people's deputies in advance. A letter from a large group of war veterans, members of the "Nazaryevo" Dacha-Building Cooperative, in which these respected people expressed outrage at the actions of the commission and the press, was distributed in the USSR Supreme Soviet together with the text of the report and other documents prepared by the commission.

Commission Member V. Yerokhin pointed out in his speech that there are certainly some people in the "Nazaryevo" Cooperative who have bought miserable little peasant houses with their modest savings. But they are only 44 of the cooperative's 237 members. Others, who have bought up grand mansions at giveaway prices include: I. Prostyakov, present administrator of affairs of the Cabinet of Ministers; his deputy A. Masterkov; A. Smirtyukov, former administrator of affairs of the Council of Ministers; V. Kozelko, head of an economic administration; his deputy Yu. Yelfimov; USSR Deputy Trade Minister P. Kondrashov; M. Anfilov, chairman of the trade union committee of the Administration of Affairs of the Cabinet of Ministers (he—chairman of a trade union committee!); Yu. Muromskiy, head of the Legislation Sector of the Administration of Affairs of the Cabinet of Ministers; and other high-ranking officials.

So, our esteemed veterans are angry for nothing. They are not the journalists' "target." It is only a pity that they swallowed the bait and let themselves be persuaded by those who organized this letter.

Another letter circulated in parliament on the eve of the hearings was signed by Prime Minister V. Pavlov himself. He expressed concern at the "problems raised in the commission's note" and, at the same time, tried to justify those out of step with elementary morality.

I think the prime minister should be worried about something quite different. Namely: Why has he allowed a couldn't-care-less attitude toward his instruction of 7 February 1991, prohibiting the sale of state dachas? On 25-26 June this year, the leadership of the USSR Ministry of the Ship Building Industry authorized the sale of 76 dachas from the dacha stock of the former USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply in the settlement of Skhodnya. It will be interesting to see whether Valentin Sergeyevich punishes anyone for disobedience.

The schemers even found advocates among the people's deputies. A. Orlov took on a thankless task. Perhaps Aleksandr Kondratyevich is a very generous person and not totally aware of what is involved? No, his actions cannot be justified from either a human or a legal point of view, because it is immoral to try to protect immorality. Especially as A. Orlov is chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Control Chamber (no more and no less). A post that requires observance of morality, as people say.

The auditorium buzzed with indignation, and the final part of his speech was drowned in the hubbub.

He repeatedly asked to be given leave to speak. In vain did he try to prove to the audience that it had misunderstood him and that he too wanted an objective investigation into each individual case. They did not believe him. Save us from our saviours, Oh Lord!—I wanted to shout from the balcony from where I was watching the dramatic developments in this three-hour-long impartial discussion on the subject of who's who.

Marshal S. Akhromeyev was at pains to justify his commercial ventures. The attempt was not crowned with success, and the final part of his speech was strongly reminiscent of petty political speculation. Naively believing that he personifies all the virtues of the top military echelon, the marshal coquettishly owned the commission's work to be a success and then proceeded to launch an attack on the mass media. In the marshal's opinion, by exposing his shady dealings, they have apparently insulted the honor and dignity of the entire USSR Armed Forces leadership!

Enough, Sergey Fedorovich. You have undoubtedly rendered services to your country, you have reached an impressive age, and you have your grandchildren to whom you should give proper attention. So why do you not leave your ship and go ashore? Besides, I think the USSR president needs more morally sound advisors.

The commission exposed those who have arranged trips for their families on military transport aircraft. It also exposed elected representatives of the people who literally besiege the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat to get cars on preferential terms. Deputies from Central Asian regions are particularly active in this respect. One of them—I. Safarov—tried to get a second car, after giving his first—a GAZ-2410—to his wife in May.

A group of deputies are demanding Moscow residence permits, and some have already obtained them or have improved their living conditions with no good reason. They are: V. Yarin, L. Sharin, A. Dzasokhov, K. Salymov, V. Foteyev, A. Mokanu, V. Vologzhin, and A. Kerimov.

The Commission on Questions of Privileges and Benefits put three draft resolutions to parliament, which aim to eliminate the uncontrolled use of state property and resources, regulate privileges and benefits for all categories of citizens by means of legislation, and ensure the mandatory prosecution of all persons found guilty of improper actions.

IZVESTIYA Reports Fifth Session's End

PM1607093191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jul 91 Union Edition pp 1-2

[Report by parliamentary correspondents A. Stepovoy and S. Chugayev: "USSR Supreme Soviet: Fifth Session Has Completed Work"]

[Text] The continuation of the discussion of the draft Union treaty was opened 12 July by Deputy G. Isayev.

The peoples of Azerbaijan and the Republic of Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet unanimously expressed themselves in favor of a single Union. As a whole the draft Union treaty was approved and a fully empowered delegation was established for signing it. Of course, the republics has comments and amendments but they cannot be obstacles to the signing of the treaty. The main thing is to think about the mechanism for insuring the implementation of the provisions of this treaty and the observance of the principles contained in it by all participants in the process.

Unfortunately, Deputy Yu. Burykh said, today we have complaints about the confederation or federation. One can regret that the treaty contains federative principles, but those are emotions. To make headway we need agreement on this subject.

Today's version of the Union treaty is now an integral document. Today's version is undoubtedly a compromise because it contains both advantages and shortcomings.

We need to approve the treaty but also to instruct the president on the two main questions to hold immediate consultations on the two positions with two republics, the Ukraine and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] on a federal tax.

And on the signing of the treaty by the RSFSR delegation.

Yu. Borodin, chairman of the committee for the protection of the people's health, drew attention to the fact that on the plane of the protection of human rights this is a step forward compared with the previous one.

The criticism of individual articles of the treaty, Deputy O. Yarovaya said, is dictated by concern for the future, for people. And at the same time it is becoming increasingly clear that everyone, both the sovereign republics and the Union authorities, should be prepared to continue the search for a compromise for the sake of preserving a unified Union.

There is no doubt that the call to achieve consensus does not mean that the fact of the signing of the treaty is more important than its content. And all sensible criticism should be considered one way or another.

Evidently the draft treaty could express itself more clearly on questions of continuity. Here the sides signing the treaty could include a delegation from the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Deputy V. Lisitskiy spoke on behalf of the "For constructive collaboration" group. The process of creating a new Union will be long if only because the impressive reallocation of property which has been begun will take a long time, as the experience of many countries shows. We cannot implement the reallocation of this property in an hour. After all, the problem of property is the problem of our entry into the world economy. It has been conceived that our renewed Union should be open to the whole world and to societies and what then would happen to our uncompetitive and inefficient economy in that open society? Of course, there is no doubt that any barriers and any obstacles to the free movement of people, ideas, and goods will delay the transformation of ownership, delay the enhancement of production efficiency, and, of course, delay our fitting advance into the world community.

In the opinion of Yu. Komarov, chairman of the committee for construction, the draft contains no clear answer to the main question: What will the state structure of the renewed Union be like—a federation, a confederation, or some community of sovereign states? The role of the former autonomous regions remains degraded.

The theme of today's talk, Deputy V. Yetylen said, goes beyond the framework of pure lawmaking work and requires the ending of political haggling and strong-arm pressure on participants in the treaty process. This subject has become a touchstone on the path toward the democratization of society for all political forces, movements, peoples, and individual territories. It is clear who understands democracy in which way. I see the way out of the crisis which has struck the Union as a federative state in the transition to a diversity of forms, to a mutual link between the Union's sovereign and autonomous units and territorial-administrative and economic units. Here there could be unitarianism and a centralized federation, autonomy and treaty-federative relations or, finally, confederative relations and even interstate legal relations. The draft does not include this diversity.

We cannot agree with the approach whereby some declarations can be acknowledged while others can be crudely and impudently pushed aside. It is these facts which have forced us deputies from the minority peoples of the North to gather for our first constituent congress of the deputies' assembly of minority peoples of the North.

The Union treaty, depending on its content, will either insure the reform of our society and the normalization of the situation in the country or could finally split and destroy our fatherland, Deputy S. Akhromeyev is convinced. The majority of the people is in favor of the Soviet Union. That was confirmed by the referendum. But on the specific content of the Union treaty regarding the country's national-state and economic structure there is no unity not only among the Union leadership and the republics' leadership but also among the country's people. We must look that truth in the eye.

The attainment of agreement is possible only on the path of compromise. Has such compromise been achieved in the draft treaty which has been submitted? I think that basically it has.

I believe that in accordance with the draft treaty the Union is being preserved. The Union is a sovereign democratic state with its own territory, borders, citizenship, coat f arms, anthem, and flag. This state has sovereign supreme organs of state power, acts independently within the framework of its powers, and has armed forces and security and law and order organs. It is there for the whole world to see and defends the state interests of the Soviet Union and performs diplomatic and foreign economic functions. These are all serious prerogatives, serious rights and duties. But the main questions of the economy have not been resolved, there is no single economic space, it is only vaguely outlined in the draft treaty.

Deputy A. Golyakov from the all-union organization of war and labor veterans noted that every aware citizen of the country is today striving with his mind and heart to feel and understand the fate of the peoples, the fate of the Union, for which the multinational brotherhood has been formed over centuries and become a common home. Now this brotherhood is being subjected to grave ordeals. Special interest in the draft treaty is being displayed by the older generation, which stood at the sources of the formation of the USSR. The draft treaty was discussed in the "fatherland" group, the committee for the affairs of veterans and invalids, and at an expanded session of the presidium of the all-union council of veterans. Opinions of the draft differ. And sometimes they are diametrically opposed. But one can be singled out: The treaty based on the principles of the renewed Union is necessary, delay in signing it will not benefit matters. We realize that the draft contains the idea of the fundamental transformation of the foundation of the Union's structure by comparison with the principles which we have contained in the present constitution. It is clear that we will not manage without compromise here.

Deputy M. Bronshteyn noted that he was speaking as a member of the Supreme Soviet, a member of the Committee for Economic Reform, and a deputy from Tartu City, Estonia.

As a member of the committee, I fully support the concept, I fully support the ideas voiced on behalf of the committee. We need to preserve a common market space. That is the chance given to us for development. Otherwise chaos and decline, a drastic decline in everyone's living standard, await us.

As a deputy from Tartu City I must consider the opinion of my electorate. And my electorate has expressed itself clearly in favor of Estonia becoming a full subject of international law. The leadership of the republic, the supreme organs, have stated that they will not sign the Union treaty, proceeding from the results of the referendum. That is not only our republic, it is the "six" as a whole. How to resolve this contradiction, that is what is rending my heart. Pretend that the Union treaty does not affect us at all? We are all too much linked with each other. That is why I urge the deputies who represent the six republics to support the desire of the nine to sign the Union treaty.

Deputy Ye. Doga stressed that the draft treaty which is being discussed is the main tuning fork of our society, the tuning fork which we want to have tuned to the frequencies of general human values. The chaos, nervousness, and often aggression in our society are the logical outcome of a totalitarian state in which one march-like rhythm, one intonation, one range, and essentially one endless song dominated. Yet after all in that enormous round dance there are millions of very unique voices and each is producing its own song. So not every song was destined to be heard because of the abundance of fanfares and drumming. Particularly the concealed song heard shyly in the depths of the soul. In our state the harmony of man and society, of nature and natural laws, was violated. The state can no longer fulfill its basic functions—protecting the interests and security of each person, nation, and people. That is why I suggest that in the preamble we record the main motives for concluding the treaty, that is concern for the peoples' material welfare and spiritual development, their unique national cultures, the safeguarding of overall security, and also the security and integrity of their territories and habitat.

Deputy Ye. Doga issued a statement. The world today is aggravated and heated to the limit. Vigorous people have become strained, exhausted, and tired of waiting, tired of clashes, of waiting in line, of uncertainty, and fear for their own lives and the life of those close to them and of the motherland. We did not choose our parents or our motherland. For each person on earth they are the only ones he has and there is nothing more sacred, nothing dearer, just as there is nothing dearer than our children, than light, than life itself. Down the ages people have guarded their homes and their land and often paid with their lives. Within their community they have always denounced and punished violators and disturb the norms of morality and calm so that consensus and peace may reign...

In my republic of Moldova very complex processes are taking place, as they are throughout the country, only Moldova is very small for such a lot of love from the so-called internationalists. Its body has been mutilated, divided, and desecrated. Its pain is my pain, for I too am a part of it, its song which has been cut short. I have not seen finer fields, more beautiful houses, or more peaceable or kinder people than in Modolva, because all this is my home, my own. And I am happy that this great feeling has been preserved. There were times when a mother and her children would try at least to hear each other through the barbed wire along the border. The tombs of my ancestors were consigned to oblivion and no flowers grew on them because flowers bloom on graves only when they are watered with tears. So do not take from us the opportunity to weep on the graves of our ancestors so that flowers may bloom on them and their perishable bodies rest in peace.

Deputy V. Stelmashonok, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet committee for culture, suggested including the following article in the text of the treaty: "The State asserts and supports by all means at its disposal the fundamental role of culture in the life and development of the individual and society. Safeguarding the country' national cultural assets and insuring the historical continuity of the cultures' sovereign development are the constitutional duty of all state organs and institutions, all enterprises and organizations, all citizens of the Union and subjects of the federation." He also voiced the opinion that the text of the treaty requires more careful editing.

The former Union treaty, Deputy Z. Balayan believes, was, at least on paper, a guarantee of the conservation of some autonomous formations, but the new treaty, instead of enhancing guarantees of security for the indigenous population of autonomous formations, essentially legalizes their destruction. The republic receives the right to determine its own national-territorial and administrative-territorial structure independently, that is bypassing the Center, bypassing the USSR Constitution. That principle can and unfailingly will be applied with regard to or primarily with regard to the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, the speaker said.

I wanted to make my first remark about the name of the Soviet of Republics, Deputy T. Pupkevich stated. As I understand it the Soviet of Nationalities by virtue of its very name already carries that load and is the meaning of its content and very idea [as published]. And I think that should be preserved in our parliament. He expressed alarm at the fact that there are very few representatives of workers and peasants in the new structures of supreme power or in the local authorities. That is a very serious reminder that, in this period of great democracy, democracy itself has nonetheless not occurred.

T. Pupkevich drew his colleagues' attention to problems of the Russian-speaking population in the Baltic republics.

First of all, what kind of state will we have according to the new Treaty? Deputy S. Savitskaya asked. The first point of the draft declares it will be a federative state. But analysis of subsequent articles convinces us that it is a case of a confederation. And the presence of a second chamber of the Soviet of Republics with very curtailed powers does not change the situation here. To safeguard the state's sovereignty it is essential to hold elections to the two chambers by direct nationwide ballot.

There is no clear status for the republics that do not sign the new treaty.

The treaty is the result of a difficult compromise but that compromise should end with precision in the principles of our state's structure and not in vague formulations.

I think that on the basis of the draft, without waiting for completion and signing of the treaty, it would be possible to sign and to begin to implement an agreement on the division of the spheres of influence of the Union and the republics.

The authors of the draft Treaty say that the opinion of the republics is to exclude the word "socialist." But after all the opinion of the population of the republics was voiced at the referendum. I think the leaders of the republics are in this case exceeding their powers. I suggest instructing the Union delegation to sign the Treaty only after legal and conceptual factors which could destroy our country's sovereignty and integrity and violate the federative principle of its structure have been removed from it.

Deputy S. Angapov also devoted the start of his speech to the name of the Union Treaty. The question legitimately arises: Why has the word "socialist" disappeared from the name and the new word "sovereign" appeared? Surely our state's course does not rule out the socialist choice? After all only recently it was being asserted that we are building a humane, democratic socialism. What has happened?

The weakest link in the draft Union Treaty is the second section. It is a case of the structure of the Union. And however strange it may seem here there is almost no mention of how our state is primarily a multinational state. That section not only fails to define the future contours of the Union's national-state structure but also fails to reflect existing national-state mutual relations. The republics and autonomous formations are in need of a status.

In the opinion of Deputy V. Samarin, the treaty should put that section of parliament which will represent the interests of civilian society, the Soviet of the Union, on an equal height with regard to the Soviet of Republics. Its decisions must not in any way be asserted or confirmed by the Soviet of the republic. Both chambers must be equal. Some of our colleagues are trying to keep all the republics at once in the Union, even if they do not want it, and to safeguard social and civil equality by the force and authority of the center. Persistent resistance to the successfully initiated dialogue between the republics will lead only to the intensification of intraparliamentary confrontation, to the entry of extreme reactionary forces into the arena, and to the escalation of nationalism and chauvinism.

I wanted to draw your attention to the ecological aspects of the draft Treaty, Deputy K. Salykov said to his colleagues. The Union of sovereign states as a whole and the sovereign states belonging to it in the present complex ecological situation in the country should be fully aware of their responsibility to society for the ecologization of state policy. The idea of the ecologization of spheres of our life was a leitmotif of the entire draft treaty.

The last hours of the work of the fifth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet passed quite stormily and tensely. Keen debates developed during the discussion of the draft resolution of the country's parliament on the draft treaty on the Union of sovereign states. As we have already reported, the debates were preceded by the concluding speech by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities. Concluding his speech, R. Nishanov answered deputies' questions. And it seems to us that these answers were a great help to parliament in concluding the debate successfully. Because the proposition that these questions are being asked by the majority of our fellow citizens today would hardly be an exaggeration.

Thus, on the last day of the work of the fifth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet debates ended on the draft Treaty on the Union of sovereign states. The draft Union Treaty, the resolution said, was mainly supported by the union parliament.

At the same sitting the parliamentarians succeeded in examining a number of other issues. A brief report on the work of the commission on deputies' ethics was delivered to the participants in the sitting by the commission's chairman, Deputy A. Denisov. Having stated that from the outset the commission refused the role of a court of law over the deputies, assuming only the task of defending their honor and dignity, he stressed that it had chosen publicity as the supreme penalty for incorrigibles. Here, from the parliamentary rostrum, A. Denisov has used that measure—those punished included Deputy N. Petrushenko, who refused to fulfill the commission's decision—to apologize to Deputy Yu. Shcherbak, whom he had unfoundedly accused of selfishly using funds allocated to eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster; Deputy V. Yerokhin, who also refused to apologize to a colleague—Deputy G. Arbatov, accused, unjustly as it emerged, of being involved in organizing a trip by a Soviet delegation to the United States for the D. Eisenhower jubilee.

The USSR Supreme Soviet responded by a majority of votes by agreeing to the proposal of the country's president to appoint M. Nenashev as the USSR minister of information and the press. And the deputies had to resolve one more problem, a quite unusual one but one which also has a bearing on the union government. Parliament received a statement from two recently appointed ministers—S. Khadzhiyev, minister of the chemical and petroleum refining industry, and O. Soskovets, minister of metallurgy. As is well known by a decision of the parliament the ministers' powers as deputies were ended ahead of schedule. The authors of the statement asked that the date for putting this resolution into action for the two of them be deferred until December. The reason given was that the ministries they head may soon cease to be ministries. A.S. Khadzhiyev and O. Soskovets will correspondingly cease to be ministers and could continue to fulfill their duties as deputies.

On behalf of the two parliamentary committees which studied this question, I. Laptev, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, commented on the situation. No grounds were found for satisfying the ministers' request, he announced. That was also the opinion of the majority of participants in the sitting—the results of the vote showed that. But eventually it was decided to examine the problem once again at the sixth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and to ask the Central Electoral Commission for the time being not to schedule elections in the districts from which S. Khadzhiyev and O. Soskovets were elected.

At the end of its last sitting the country's parliament also adopted a resolution on the work of the commission for questions of privileges and benefits and on measures to implement the commission's proposals.

And so the fifth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet has ended its work. Its results were summed up in his speech by A. Lukyanov, chairman of the country's parliament (his speech is published in today's issue of IZVESTIYA).

Ahead are the parliamentary vacation and the sixth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The first day of its work is 16 September.

Political & Social

Internal Affairs Minister Pugo Interviewed

LD1407043391 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1100 GMT 13 Jul 91

[Interview with USSR Internal Affairs Minister Boris Pugo by commentator Boris Kondratov; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Kondratov] This is the program Radio Studio Ostanikino on the line. This is commentator Boris Kondratov. Speaking with us today is Boris Karlovich Pugo, minister of internal affairs of the USSR. We have invited him to answer listeners' questions connected with the activity of internal affairs bodies, the work of the militia, and to tell us about how the fight against crime is going. [passage omitted] Now I have chosen questions mainly from listeners' letters we have received recently. Here is one of the most frequently recurring questions: What are the functions of the Union Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], and what remains in the jurisdiction of the republican ministries? I'd like to start our conversation with this question.

[Pugo] This is probably one of the most basic questions, Boris Fedorovich. I know very well that this question worries the workers in our system and that the citizens of our country are very interested in it. But I would like to say immediately that it will only be possible to answer this question in full once the new Union treaty has been concluded, because we shall only find out what it will be like after the last signature has been put on it.

But in any case, we can already foresee today, at least judging by the drafts of the Union Treaty that have been published in the paper, we can say that what comes under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Internal Affairs will obligatorily include—as it does now—coordination of activity in fighting crime. At the moment its functon is wider; at the moment it is written that the ministry carries out the function of overall direction. In connection with the fact that it is planned to preserve only coordination, our functions will change significantly. The draft says that the ministry will remain in charge of internal troops. It is planned that there should be quite a wide sphere of joint authority between the Union and republics. The joint sphere would cover the organization of the fight against crime in the territories of several republics, ensuring the functioning of the all-Union criminal register and information system. This is extremely important and this can only be done by a Union body, or with the participation of a Union body. So perhaps in the most general terms that is how the demarcation of functions of the Union and republican ministries are envisaged.

[Kondratov] Indeed, crime doesn't admit to borders within our country.

[Pugo] Absolutely right. And on that level you can say that this is very well understood by all professionals, people whose job it is to fight crime, who do this work every day and every hour. And I would like to say that not long ago there was another conference, a meeting of the heads of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs with the ministry heads of all the Union republics; and I should like to stress that all republics took part in this conference, including the nine republics that have already said they would take part in the new Union and those six republics that have not yet said their last word. [passage omitted] I think it is a very good thing that there is an understanding between heads of law and order bodies and in spite of the fact that there are different points of view about certain questions today, we are finding ways to solve or to examine them.

[Kondratov] Boris Karlovich, it is evident that international activity will also come under the functions of your ministry, because we have joined Interpol now; so some of these problems connected with our country and with foreign countries on the criminal level....

[Pugo] Boris Fedorovich, you are asking the question as if it were perfectly natural that we should be engaged in these questions, that's to say international links, in which all the republics have an interest, as if the center should be involved with them. But I'll also say frankly that we are living in quite a complex time. Some republics want at all costs to approach the law and order bodies of other countries autonomously, and I would say that I don't see this as any great disaster, because ... or not even a disaster, I don't even see any difficulties. Because the republics are sovereign, I think their autonomy should increase even further and grow. So it is natural that the law and order bodies, as fundamental bodies, it seems to me that logic should dictate that here too there is a need for coordination. Because cooperation is, will be, and is today being implemented not simply thanks to some contacts or other, but in order to gain some experience from others, in order to get some technology. If we are all to act separately, without coordination, this won't benefit the law enforcement system as a whole. We shall all lose.

[Kondratov] Here is a second question from Comrade Demchenko. It is quite close to the first one, arises out of it: What are the relations between your Ministry of Internal Affairs and the republican ones, in particular the Baltic and Transcaucasian republics? Does the Ministry of Internal Affairs monitor the activity of the police departments and similar groupings in these republics?

[Pugo] This question is asked by Comrade Demchenko?

[Kondratov] That's right.

[Pugo] Well, Boris Fedorovich, I would like to say that from my point of view the very articulation of this question is perhaps somewhat out of date. As I said at the very outset, the mutual relations between the MVD and the republics' MVD's have lately undergone significant changes. They reflect the new political and state and legal realities. Consequently, if we talk about our mutual relations with the Baltic and Transcaucasus republics and Moldova, greater preference is given here to professional issues. Just like with the other republics, we do not strive to command, to impose our point of view. The republics have their own interests, including the republics about which Comrade Demchenko asks, and we are building these mutual relations—I say again—on a strictly professional basis, taking account of the prevailing operational situation.

At the very outset we said that crime is transterritorial. Sometimes republics ask us to assist them in finding this or that criminal through their own efforts. There are many issues on which we maintain permanent contacts. These are equally in the field of material and equipment supply and the provision of information available to us. But the most important thing, I emphasize again, is professional contacts, contacts between our main operational directorates, that's the Criminal Investigations Directorate, the service for struggle against misappropriation of property. At present, issues of struggle against organized crime are acquiring great signfiicance. So as it is in this respect and in this direction that this collaboration is being implemented. And if we speak about, like it is sometimes said: Can you order the ministers?

[Kondratov] I too wanted to ask this.

[Pugo] I can see from your expression that you wanted to ask this. That period is probably behind us. Now, let's say the Russian Federation has adopted a law on militia, and this law states the Russian militia is subordinated only to bodies of power of the Russian Federation. But irrespective of this statement, we maintain completely businesslike, normal relations with their ministry, just like with all the republics.

[Kondratov] Boris Karlovich, if we take a specific situation, for instance, a citizen in Estonia is dissatisfied with the activities of the local—is it policemen they have there now?

[Pugo] That's right, they have police there now.

[Kondratov] Right, so he's complained to the local police bodies, then to the department, and then he is not satisfied with the results which follow his complaint. So in essence he can no longer go to the Union ministry?

[Pugo] They do. And we get a great many letters, from those very republics. And I would like to emphasize that we do not put these letters to one side. We work on them; we contact these republics' ministries. For instance, lately many militia workers, employees were worried by issues connected with the fact that, let's say, according to the law in Lithuania it is necessary to swear an oath to the Lithuanian Republic, while militia employees say that they once swore an oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the USSR as a whole. What is one to do in this instance? Far from an easy issue, that's right. I think we have managed to find a way out of this situation. We have agreed with the leadership of the republic that if this process takes place, of Lithuania leaving the USSR—after all, today this has merely been defined as an objective, but the republic remains in the USSR—we agreed, for this transitional period, not to insist on the oath being compulsory; that our staff could work on the basis of the previous oath.

[Kondratov] Then you have already answered a question I wanted to put to you, namely: What has been the fate of the former staff of the internal affairs bodies in the Baltic and Caucasus republics, where the Ministry of Internal Affairs system has collapsed? The question comes from Comrade Matskevich from Kharkov. You have touched on this question already.

[Pugo] Yes, and I should perhaps say that the system as such has not actually collapsed. If there are those who think the system has collapsed, this would quite simply be a very harmful misconception.

[Kondratov] But perhaps people are led into such misconceptions by the proliferation of terms—police, militia, and so on.

[Pugo] Yes, though the term "police" implies a body for combating crime which carries out all its activities solely on a professional footing; whereas the term "militia" implies broad participation by the people. Yet in many countries—Hungary, for instance, has joined this group in recent years, and now China—what we call "militia" are called "police". And there are no doubts in anyone's mind about what is meant. So, in my view politicized elements are being introduced here. And the main thing is that the system has not collapsed; the system continues to exist. But its activities are now becoming different from what they were before—less based on instructions and more on agreement and coordination.

[Kondratov] But it seems to me that for you as minister things must be quite complicated at present, because of this period of reorganization of the whole system in the country.

[Pugo] Of course. And we are coming up against a lack of understanding. There are comrades, citizens who in letters and submissions to the Ministry of Internal Affairs sometimes criticize, asking why we have relaxed our discipline, so that they are no longer obedient. But that is simply a misreading of the situation. The situation is changing, and life has to be organized to take account of the realities of today.

[Kondratov] Boris Karlovich, here is a question it is just impossible to sidestep nowadays. To what extent are the activities of the OMON [Special Purpose Militia] detachments under control—being subordinate as they are to the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs—in Latvia, Lithuania, and to local ministries (?in) Azerbaijan? This question comes from Sergey Vasilyevich Gernikov from Krasnodar. Well, the fact is that, concerned as we were by rising crime, at the beginning we welcomed the appearance of these detachments—citizens and radio listeners have talked about this—these OMON detachments with their powerfully-built lads in good physical condition. We welcomed this with approval, as it were, at the beginning, thinking that we were getting down to tackling crime in a determined way. But then certain incidents began to make it look as though these detachments had gotten out of control.

[Pugo] Of late much has been written in the press and said with regard to the Baltic OMON's and the Latvian OMON in particular. I would like to say that OMON's—special purpose militia detachments—have been set up in 34 capitals and oblast and kray centers of our country; and at present they are being set up in smaller towns as well, in particular in the country's resorts and in the Far East.

[Kondratov] Who are they subordinate to?

[Pugo] These bodies are subordinate directly—and by all means must be subordinate—to the local bodies of government, to militia. This is the way it works everywhere. These detachments are set up on the minister's instruction, but their activities after that must be closely supervised by the local territorial bodies. OMON's are set up with the aim of ensuring public order during various mass events. They must act if any complications develop as a result of natural disasters, epidemics, major accidents and catastrophies, and in any other emergency situation. Apart from this the task of OMON's is to take part in detaining armed criminals. They must act in places of deprivation of liberty, for example, if there are any complications there. The strength of these OMON's is only in the region of 9,000 people in the country. The strength of each detachment, as you can see from the given figure, is not so big.

[Kondratov] Not big, no.

[Pugo] For example, the OMON in Latvia has about 150 people and the Lithuanian OMON has approximately the same number of members. The situation was complex there. You see, OMON's were functioning inside the ministerial system...

[Kondratov] You are talking about the Baltic republics, aren't you?

[Pugo] Yes, the Baltic republics. Everything went well and I think the OMON activities were appreciated very much and supported by the population, by the entire population in equal measure, until a very difficult period—the well-known exacerbation, so to speak. A change in the political situation took place in the Baltic republics. Since it was proclaimed in these republics, first and foremost in Lithuania, that ... the declaration on independence was proclaimed and a categorical demand was voiced with regard to militia workers, that they should only follow the laws of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic. A collision, so to speak, a difficulty has developed. Part of the OMON personnel announced that they continue to adhere to the positions of protecting and implementing the Union Constitution and Union laws. And, unfortunately, this very act, between the republic Supreme Soviets and the USSR Supreme Soviet, was never made quite clear. According to the laws adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet, in cases when there are disagreements between Union and republican laws, the Union law is applied. However, unfortunately, Supreme Soviets of the Baltic republics took a different stand. It would seem quite reasonable that if a republic's Supreme Soviet considers a law adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet not to be in keeping with conditions in the republic or with the republic's views, they should appeal to the Supreme Soviet, to the Constitutional Supervision Committee, or to the president, in order to make the situation clear. However, in actual fact it looks quite different. Actually, the presidential decree was adopted, according to which the customs posts were to stop their activities. However, in the Baltics the custom posts continued to function and are continuing to function today. This contradicts the presidential decree.

We have a single territory and a single economic space. And in this situation the OMON—as many listeners probably know from the programs which were at some point shown by Nevzorov in his "600 seconds" slot—part of the personnel took part in what, in fact, amounted to eliminating these custom posts by force.

[Kondratov] And this is, actually, where the question lies: They could not have possibly made such a decision themselves, could they? And if they did, this is bad. Of course, there should have been no customs posts like that; this is clear, since this is against the law. However, the trouble is that if someone at a level of, say, a major—or whoever the commander of the detachment is—makes such a decision by himself....

[Pugo] This is where the essence of the issue lies.

[Kondratov] Yes.

[Pugo] Although things are even more complex here. Because in these republics, there are procuracies—dual procuracies—both the procuracies of republics and those that are subordinate to the USSR procurator general. And the situation has taken shape that these OMON's have been, actually, coordinating all their activities with the procuracies of socialist republics....

[Kondratov] Republics which are subordinate to the Union procuracy.

[Pugo] Yes, the Union procuracy. No doubt that is the reason why this situation became so complex. I believe we should return to the arrangement whereby OMON activities were based solely on the old USSR Council of Ministers' decision on this subject. These OMON units must definitely ensure that they operate in close cooperation with territorial bodies. In the event that some officers did not wish to accept this position, we proposed that some of them should transfer—of their own free will—to the special assignment detachments of the Interior Ministry troops, for instance. We have such detachments, including some which are stationed in the Baltic republics. But these servicemen, OMON officers, refused to transfer. We will study this question. At any rate, this unsettled situation cannot be allowed to continue. In fact it can't be described as "unsettled" any longer. These OMON units are currently under the direct command of the Main Directorate for Maintenance of Public Order of the USSR MVD. Their activities are under control.

[Kondratov] I believe that not so long ago you held a meeting with members of these OMON units, including ones from the Baltic republics, to which journalists were invited. There was some quite tough talk about all these matters.

[Pugo] Yes, that meeting was held. I think we will sort all these questions out for ourselves.

[Kondratov] Here is yet another difficult question. What is going on with the Moscow militia? Let me read the letter: The tug- of-war between the Russian MVD on the one hand, and the Moscow city executive committee on the other, over who should run the militia and the uncompromising position of the Union MVD on this question cannot fail to affect the force's morale and, therefore, the drive against crime. That was from Comrade Ogorodnikov of Moscow. I think very many Muscovites could subscribe to those views. The important thing is not so much the formal aspect of the matter—jurisdiction over the Moscow militia—but rather the impact on the force's morale and the drive against crime, as the letter correctly stresses. After all, the rank-and-file militiamen in Moscow ultimately needs to know who he answers to, whose commands he is supposed to obey.

[Pugo] Boris Fedorovich, I would like to give this answer to Comrade Ogorodnikov and other listeners who are interested in the question. In the first place, Moscow is the capital of the USSR. It is also the capital of the Russian Federation. Furthermore, Moscow is a major cultural and economic center; it is a huge city with its own problems, complexities, and difficulties. But the important point is that it is the capital of both the USSR and the Russian Federation. Therefore, we believe that its future status should be defined by the law on the city of Moscow's status as capital of the USSR and the Russian Federation. It must definitely be discussed by the USSR Supreme Soviet—in all likelihood—and by the Russian Supreme Soviet, with the direct participation of Moscow's own leadership. We believe that Union legislation has applied up to now to Moscow.

At the beginning of the year a very great deal was written about this confrontation, as it was called, between the leadership of the USSR MVD and the leadership of the Moscow Soviet. I certainly don't want to exacerbate this problem again today. Muscovites know that Lieutenant General (Mylikov) has been appointed head of the Moscow militia. He has spent over 30 years with the Moscow force. People know him.

[Kondratov] People know him, yes, the ones who have anything to do with this.

[Pugo] He is indeed a highly skilled professional. In general, there is probably no longer a problem with this candidature. But a special directorate has now been set up to handle questions connected with the coordination of the Main Moscow Directorate and the Oblast Directorate. The transport militia operates on their territory. The higher militia school is also located there. Very large numbers of militiamen work there and they really are insisting that their activities be well coordinated. Therefore, this coordination will be carried out. I think it is useful and this is acknowledged by virtually all militia officers themselves. This is very necessary because, unfortunately, the increase in crime is continuing even now.

For instance, during the last six months, crime in Moscow has increased by a further 11 percent.

[Kondratov] That is less than the country as a whole.

[Pugo] That is less than the country as a whole, where unfortunately it has increased by 20 percent.

[Kondratov] Yes.

[Pugo] But be that as it may, we must do our utmost to insure that militiamen in Moscow, just like militiamen in any other area, can do their job with confidence, in a calm atmosphere. They should not be pulled this way and that or be in any doubt as to who their chief is and whose orders they have to obey.

[Kondratov] Yes, but we will probably have to wait until the law on the city's status is adopted.

[Pugo] I think that we should all show patience...

[Kondratov] Yes, yes, let all quarrels and disagreements subside.

[Pugo]...so that the law on Moscow's status can be adopted. [passage omitted]

[Kondratov] As minister, what areas do you intend to concentrate your efforts on? You are a relatively new minister. How long have you been the internal affairs minister?

[Pugo] Eight months have already passed. So, you are entitled to ask the question.

[Kondratov] I think I can ask you not just what you intend to concentrate on, but what you have already been concentrating on during this time.

[Pugo] That is probably a better question. I have already said that the question that bothers me most at the moment is how the system will function after the signing of the Union treaty.

[Kondratov] I see.

[Pugo] The most important thing to do is to sort out these questions. Second, we are continuing our work—I consider this very important—on ways of improving the effectiveness of our activities. Furthermore, we are seeking to insure that the individual is the focus of our work. That is very important. After all, for very many years our main concern, just like that of the state as a whole, was for the state's interests. Now we are shifting the focus in such a way as to think more about actual people, to insure that the living individual is the focus of attention. That is not so simple, you know, because of the understanding, developed over many years, that the interests of the state were supreme.

[Kondratov] Yes.

[Pugo] Now we have to think of ways of insuring that the individual feels he is protected ...

[Kondratov] That he is protected by the state, yes.

[Pugo]...that the militia protects him, that he is confident of being protected, that his safety will be insured, that all this will be guaranteed.

[Kondratov] Excuse me for interrupting you. From our childhood years we have all heard of these departments for combating the embezzlement of socialist property. I believe they are already being renamed. The emphasis now is not being placed on state property alone but also on citizens' property.

[Pugo] The militia have always protected everyone.

[Kondratov] Yes.

[Pugo] Nevertheless, priority was always given to the interests of the state ...

[Kondratov] You are absolutely right.

[Pugo]...and state property. We are now restructuring, and we need to do so quickly because we have a duty to provide equal protection to cooperative property and personal, private property. In general, this is the basis of everything. We are now giving a lot of thought to ways of improving the vocational training of our personnel. New people are coming into our ranks. So, it is very important to insure that we really do have highly professional people working for us. That is one of the most important questions.

[Kondratov] (Yuliya Chertkova), our editor, has just entered the studio. She has been fielding questions received over the telephone. Yuliya, what else is there to offer?

[(Chertkova)] There are so many questions that I do not know where to start. Let us take this one, for instance. People's deputy (Vladimir Aleksandrovich Yevseyev) from Murmansk asks primarily about the GUID system, the Main Directorate for Correctional Affairs, the system of camps and corrective institutions. Are there any plans to allocate any additional money for its reorganization? And not just money—will it in fact be reformed and reorganized?

[Pugo] I would like to reply to the people's deputy...

[(Chertkova)] (Yevseyev).

[Pugo] Comrade (Yevseyev), that the actual system of the corrective labor institutions has now been completely handed over to the republics, therefore, all questions about material-technical provision for them should be directly resolved by the ministries of internal affairs in the Union republics. The USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has been left with the functions of coordinating this very large system. Due to inertia...very often, issues connected with material-technical provision are very often queried at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and we continue to tackle them, we do not abdicate responsibility, but now we definitely tackle them with the participation of the ministries from the Union republics. Therefore, specifically, he should apply to the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the USSR [corrects himself] of the Russian Federation.

[(Chertkova)] [passage omitted] Another question from the same person. Are there plans to hold meetings of people's deputies who work for the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

[Pugo] This form should definitely be used. We have already got the deputies together, but I do not know...he is a people's deputy...

[(Chertkova)] of the Murmansk Soviet.

[Pugo] Of the Murmansk Soviet. Of course, we will probably not be able to gather together deputies of all levels since there are so many of them, but we have used this form and we will use it in the future, and when we hold the next meeting, I will make a note of this, and I will definitely invite him. I will definitely invite (Vladimir Aleksandrovich) to the meeting.

[(Chertkova)] [passage omitted] A very important issue: We have had a lot of calls on this subject. We have simply stopped registering them. Is the militia tackling the problems of markets in Moscow and other large towns, as there are not many militiamen, but the price setting system has been very well worked out by traders? Prices are very high, and are kept at the same level, so radio listeners comment that the actions of the market mafia, so to speak, can be detected, even without the use of armed force.

[Pugo] Measures are being undertaken, but I must agree with those listeners who asked about the effectiveness of militia activities. At the moment, here in the center at least, it is just not sufficient. I take this question as being a call for militia activity to be stepped up even more and to draw the attention of all militia bodies to the need for the fight against speculation, against those who set these high prices on the market. This question is absolutely correct.

[(Chertkova)] This is not a call, it is simply a cry for help, as there have been very many calls.

[Pugo] I think that many militiamen are also listening to us, and I would simply like to address those in my service, not only to call upon them, but I would like to directly instruct them that as from tomorrow, measures need to be undertaken to try and restore order. [passage omitted]

[(Chertkova)] Incidentally, do you know, it is very interesting, Comrade (Fedorov)—I think that he is from Kiev as well, and is in some way connected with the internal affairs bodies as is very well-informed, he says—and I know this as well as I was recently at a briefing, but radio listeners probably are not aware of this— in the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, a special section dealing with the fight against corruption within the internal affairs bodies has been set up. Comrade (Fedorov), in connection with this very situation in the markets and so on, asks to what degree is there corruption in these bodies at the present time, and has it readlly reached such a high level that is was necessary to set up a special directorate?

[Pugo] Generally speaking, there are many indications that corruption has penetrated the internal affairs bodies, and annually we dismiss from our bodies and put on trial quite a large number of militiamen; therefore, the setting up of such a subunit is, generally speaking, well-founded, and we need it to function properly.

[(Chertkova)] It is still too early to talk about results.

[Pugo] It is still too early to talk about results.

[(Chertkova)] There are, as far as I know, only 15 people. The next question from a militia captain in Bashkiria, Comrade (Dukhlotulin), asks whether or not the rumors he has heard are true, that the penitentiary service, that is service for those—I am explaining this for the benefit of our listeners—who serve outside corrective labor institutions—is that moving out of militia jurisdiction?

[Pugo] These questions are also often asked among the country's academic lawyers; the subject is very extensively discussed. It is true that a number of countries structure their system of corrective labor institutions on principles different from ours. The specialists are studying this question. How it will be decided in the future, I cannot say now, but at least I know that in the Russian Federation I think the mood—and not just the mood, but I think certain distinctive approaches have been found, and we will see in the very near future... [(Chertkova) interrupts, words indistinct as both speak at once]

[(Chertkova)]...(?subordination) to the militia. But the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs does not intend to do so as yet?

[Pugo] Inasmuch as the system itself has been handed over to the republic, and we already see today that it is beginning to be structured on certain principles of its own, let us say, in Estonia, for example, the principles on which that system is built already differ considerably from those that have existed throughout the country up until now. So it is a matter for the republics.

[(Chertkova)] Another question: Comrade (Pavlov, Vladimir Perrovich), from Ivano Oblast, asks you to explain to listeners a little bit about the issue of self-defense and the question of the possession of arms of any kind by citizens in our country.

[Pugo] That is a question that a great many people have recently been asking, and deputies at various levels have been approaching us and suggesting that citizens as such should be given the opportunity to acquire weapons or some other...

[(Chertkova)] Gas weapons?

[Pugo] Gas weapons. A draft law on this question has not been prepared. It has not yet been discussed at the Supreme Soviet. But we at the ministry have gathered together specialists, and journalists have also taken part in this conference. I think we shall simply gather a broader public opinion so we can, well, put to the legislative bodies some more substantial proposals.

[(Chertkova)] But meanwhile, Comrade Pugo, it has to be said that if someone is sent abroad and buys a gas cannister or gas pistol there, customs will confiscate it from him.

[Pugo] They will; and in general, under the present law, its possession is not yet permitted. He just has to rely on his own fists and [words indistinct] do physical training and train his muscles so he can rely on that.

[Passage omitted]

[Kondratov] There is a question from Comrade (Abramyan) of Tikhoretsk. The demands made on the judicial system for thoroughness, quality, and strict legality of investigation have increased. The volume of crime, however, has exceeded the available capacity of the investigation service. Serious crime is increasing and convictions are falling. What is the answer? Maybe we should estabish a program for a nationwide drive against crime. Well, I do not exactly know what the position is in the Ministry of Internal Affairs, but investigators employed by the procuratorate, which investigates particularly serious crimes like murder, are quite simply groaning under the burden.

[Pugo] Well, the same applies to the investigative bodies of the ministry, because the burden on the investigators employed by its agencies is even greater. In a number of regions it exceeds all permissible levels. [passage omitted] The courts and procuratorate need to maintain high standards of investigation. Every year 6-7 percent of all cases are returned to the ministry for reinvestigation. This shows that investigation work needs to be more painstaking.

[Kondratov] No doubt investigators have to conduct several cases at a time.

[Pugo] Not just several—sometimes they even have to handle several score at the same time. This is wholly abnormal. [passage omitted]

[Kondratov] What about the second part of the question, Boris Karlovich? The questioner suggested that the establishment of a program for a nationwide drive against crime might be the answer to the problem.

[Pugo] This question is absolutely right. Quite recently the Cabinet of Ministers endorsed a specific program of integrated measures for tackling manifestations of economic sabotage, corruption, pilfering and profiteering. Work has been completed on the drafting of a Union-wide program for a drive against crime. This draft will shortly be tabled for examination by legislators. [passage omitted]

[(Chertkova)] First, Comrade (Gronin) from Vilnius asks: What is your attitude toward private detective agencies? That is the first half of the question. Second, do you not think that militia bodies have been very hostile to private detective agencies from the start? They regard them as obvious competition.

[Pugo] Well, if you regard this as a humorous topic, I do not think I can agree with you.

[(Chertkova)] No, no. Not a humorous topic.

[Pugo] Such a trend is indeed emerging now in many regions of the country. Various organizations are being set up that are beginning to compete with internal affairs agencies. We consider that such organizations should be allowed. Many of them have already been set up. We know that a number of them are operating at airports, for instance, providing services there. There are cooperatives that carry out various law-enforcement functions. So, in general, the ice has broken in this respect. If their activities become more effective, I think they will prompt us into improving our own work.

[(Chertkova)] I see. In other words, you do not disapprove of them.

[Pugo] No, I believe that they should be allowed.

[Chertkova] And here is yet another question...

[Pugo, interrupting] But I wish to add straightaway that, as far as I am concerned, organizations of this type must register with internal affairs bodies without fail. Internal affairs bodies must know about them. Maintenance of law and order is a serious business. Serious clashes—unpleasant conflicts even—could occur if appropriate information is not given. The second point concerns weapons. These cooperatives do not have the right to use weapons.

[(Chertkova)] They do not have the right, you say, but it is quite difficult to defend oneself without a weapon.

[Pugo] Current legislation does not allow them to be armed.

[Kondratov] Our time has already run out.

[(Chertkova)] What a pity, we were not able to answer some interesting questions.

[Kondratov] Yes, I realize that some questions still have not been answered. Boris Karlovich, this is the first time you have taken part in our hour-long program. The last hour has shown that there was not enough time to answer many questions. Perhaps we should agree to make these meetings regular ones.

[Pugo] If this is of interest to listeners, then I think we will definitely agree. The evidence of today's program alone tells me that there are many questions that need to be thought over—not just thought over but resolved. We need to find ways of solving them. So, I thank the listeners who took part in today's program and asked questions. We will try to be useful to them.

[Kondratov] Well, in two or three months we will probably meet again in the studio.

[Pugo] Let us hope so.

[Kondratov] It will depend on you, first and foremost.

[Pugo] Thank you for your attention. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Message Hails War Veterans

PM1607100191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2

[President M.S. Gorbachev message: "To the Participants in the Television Marathon 'Veterans of All Wars For Peace and Democracy'"]

[Text] In all its long history, mankind has not known all that many years of peace and accord. Wars are continuing even now, on the eve of the third millennium. They are begun by politicians but waged by soldiers.

No matter how lofty the aims used to justify wars and no matter how victorious those wars may be, they always contain not only victors and vanquished but also victims. First and foremost those victims are the soldiers, killed or maimed on the battlefield, and the civilians on the warring sides drawn voluntarily or involuntarily into the flames of internecine conflicts. These losses are beyond comparison with material losses because everything destroyed by war can be replaced whereas no one can give a mother back her son, a wife her husband, or children their father. Not even the most sophisticated wheelchair will restore the health of a soldier maimed by war and even those who have survived intact in battle will not quickly forget the horrors of the artillery fire and bombardments, the hand-to-hand combat, and the point-blank shooting.

That is why I value and appreciate the feelings of Soviet veterans and internationalist servicemen who sponsored the holding of the international telemarathon "Veterans of All Wars for Peace and Democracy." I think that the appeal to peace and good-neighborliness, which represents a noble action by Soviet veterans' organizations, will find a response in different countries of the world among veterans of past wars and representatives of democratic movements for peace and disarmament.

The path to a just world order and a world without wars and aggression lies not only in meetings of leaders of states and in diplomats' offices. The more people of good will, including veterans of past wars who have known from personal experience the mortal fatigue of mutual destruction, decide to extend to one another a hand free of the weapons stockpiled in the world, the less chance there will be of unleashing new wars, which place the existence of all mankind in jeopardy.

I express the confidence that representatives of all countries and peoples who value the peace and prosperity of our common home will join the initiative of Soviet veterans and internationalist servicemen under the slogan "Veterans of all wars for peace and democracy."

[Signed] M. Gorbachev, President of the USSR.

CPSU Control Commission To Assess Dacha Abuse

PM1607091191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Jul 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Ye.A. Yeliseyev, deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission, by unnamed TASS correspondent; date and place not specified; first paragraph is introduction: "Principled Position"]

[Text] Of late certain newspapers have published articles about state dachas and property being sold to a number of high-ranking officials at prices considerably below their effective cost. Considering that most of these officials are members of the CPSU, a TASS correspondent put the following question to Ye.A. Yeliseyev, deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Control Commission:

[TASS correspondent] How does the Central Control Commission regard this kind of "privatization"?

[Yeliseyev] IZVESTIYA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, and other newspapers have by and large used material from the USSR Supreme Soviet Privileges and Benefits Commission. This subject has been vigorously discussed by the country's Supreme Soviet and Cabinet of Ministers. In this context, we asked Commission Chairman N.I. Ignatovich and Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov to hand over the necessary documents. We hope that the USSR Supreme Soviet and law-enforcement organs will thoroughly investigate this problem and adopt a fair decision. As for Communists who have abused their official position and breached the norms of party ethics, without fail they will be appropriately assessed by party organizations and control organs, including the CPSU Central Control Commission.

[TASS correspondent] One more question, Yevgeniy Aleksandrovich. Have there been cases of dachas belonging to the CPSU being sold to party officials?

[Yeliseyev] According to the information at our disposal, no.

'Democratic Reforms Movement' 'Nothing Unusual'

PM1607085391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Press Center"]

[Text] Public attention has been drawn these days to the appeal by a group of politicians who have initiated the creation of the "Democratic Reforms Movement."

Not all the points in the appeal are perceived unambiguously. Nevertheless, the leadership of the CPSU Central Committee does not rule out the possibility of constructive cooperation among party members within the framework of the "Democratic Reforms Movement" on condition that the proclaimed aims are corroborated by its operating practice.

The emergence of a new sociopolitical association in itself is nothing unusual in the present conditions. At the same time the lessons of recent years persuade us that more than one of the public movements which came into being beneath slogans of support for perestroyka have subsequently betrayed their originally proclaimed aims. It is not without grounds that Communists perceive certain statements by the movement's initiators as attempts at a kind of sounding out of various trends in the CPSU and of the positions of individual Communists. It is not hard to foresee that this could be followed by practical actions aimed at splitting our party. And this naturally puts them definitely on their guard.

In these conditions the CPSU Central Committee believes that party organizations and Communists must show profound understanding of the evolving situation and of their responsibility for preserving the party's unity and consolidating it on the basis of the 28th congress decisions and of the all-party discussion of the new CPSU Program due in the very near future.

IZVESTIYA Examines Novo-Ogarevo Accord

PM1507114191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jul 91 Union Edition p 1

[M. Berger "Political Diary": "What is Behind the Accord: In Novo-Ogarevo the Politicians Demonstrated the Ability To Unite Not Only in the Face of Danger but Also in the Expectation of Success"]

[Text] The agreement reached in Novo-Ogarevo demonstrated one important political quality: the ability to unite not only in the face of a looming danger (which our society has discovered more than once) but also with a view to the possible favorable development of events.

The prospect of effective international cooperation in extricating our country from economic decline and making the transition to the market prompted the leaders of the nine republics to show features not very characteristic of the new generation of politicians. Of course, the term "unite" is too strong for this occasion, but the fundamental ability to negotiate and elaborate a coordinated position was clearly discovered.

According to the evidence of the participants in the 8 July meeting in Novo-Ogarevo, an atmosphere of mutual understanding and accord reigned there. And its unusual brevity—"just" three hours and a quite tangible and concrete result—is evidence of the emergence of new political realities. What is behind this accord, without which, it is absolutely clear, the USSR President's trip to London would have been purely for show and would have had no chance of promoting the development of events in our country's favor? On what foundation is this community based and how firm and lasting will it be?

There is hardly enough justification for the excessive raptures of the official accounts of the "team spirit" which observers experienced when looking at the "comrades in arms" who, as a TASS observer writes, performed a major, very difficult, but vitally necessary deed. I think that if a commentator had used the words "team of comrades in arms" to describe the leaders of the G-7 or the leaders of the EC countries, whose ability to create a common economic space has become a popular example, they simply would not have understood him.

The deed accomplished recently in Novo-Ogarevo was indeed major and difficult. But it was done not by experts and advisers to whom this sports term could have been applied, albeit with reservations. It is inapplicable in this instance, however, because the members of the members of a team are not elected but selected, which cannot be said of the founders of the future federation gathered in Novo-Ogarevo. Before us are democratically elected leaders of sovereign republics acting not to the orders of the "team coach" but on the basis of their own vision of the problem and the interests of the peoples they represent. They may have different views of one and the same problem, they adhere to different philosophical positions, and, as is well known, they do not all belong to the same party. But the accord achieved, not prescribed or proclaimed, and the support which the USSR President received from them, are all the more valuable.

At an impromptu press conference after the meeting, M. Gorbachev noted they were all united by a sense of common responsibility. Probably, that sense really did seize the participants in the meeting but would not have been enough by itself to achieve accord, especially since ideas of responsibility by no means always coincide. For example, differences of opinion remain in the government program of joint actions to extricate the economy from crisis signed by the representatives of the nine republics and the union government. Russia and the Ukraine do not agree with the center on questions of tax policy and here the sense of responsibility is either not strong enough to achieve accord or this concept itself is interpreted differently by the different sides. (Without going into the essence of the disagreements and the substantive part of the program, let us note in passing that the very fact of its being signed as yet another major political achievement of recent days, like the readiness and ability to cooperate even when there are differences of opinion).

No, this time in Novo-Ogarevo there was something else which, in conjunction with responsibility, brought the leaders' positions as close together as possible. That something is a realization of the real benefit of cooperation with the developed Western countries, which is not feasible without the achievement of accord. There are far more points of contact in the perception of advantage and economic expediency than in the perception of responsibility. It is the degree of realization of the economic interests of the republics and the program of cooperation with the West, both in the anticrisis measures and in the general market reforms, that will primarily determine the degree of durability of the accord achieved. On the other hand, the character and scale of the developed countries' participation in resolving our problems depend directly on the existence of accord and political stability in the USSR.

Admittedly, this is the minimum essential but insufficient condition for obtaining really large-scale and diverse help. To obtain that help it will need irrefutable proof of the readiness and ability to implement market reforms. For all the respect for our military might and influence on world politics, the West will hardly tolerate the position of the USSR as the "planned loss-making enterprise" of the world community demanding constant subsidies. And whatever the supporters of the alternatives to the market form of development may say, those who have amassed capital on this "incorrect" path will not offer anything but advice and, perhaps, humanitarian aid to a country which does not want to build a market economy of its own. Of course, each state has the right to determine its own path of development and form of economic organization for itself, but equally inalienable is the right of those who own capital to decide for themselves the question or whether to give support or not.

No matter how significant the achievement in Novo-Ogarevo today, the political leaders are still only at the very beginning of the path to accord. It is one thing to approve the concept that the USSR President will take to London, another to adhere to the line of economic conduct which necessarily stems from that concept. Unfortunately, as recent practice shows, the economy is increasingly often an object of trade in political auctions where politicians vie with one another in the satisfaction of social claims, to see who will give most. For example, the extra compensation paid out by the republics by the end of the year will be around 45 billion rubles, which taken together with the other inflationary actions of the republic authorities and the center, could lead to a budget deficit of 140 billion rubles. And these are the most cautious estimates. Such gaps in the budget, irrespective of the explanation of the reasons for their occurrence, give rise to a host of questions, including regarding the ability to control the situation with regard to money circulation. Whether it will prove possible to agree and, most important, to act in a coordinated way in this sphere—that is where the depth and durability of the accord that was achieved will be tested. Otherwise, to expect support and financial assistance is to indulge in illusion.

Bolsheviks Urge Loyalty to 'True Socialism'

LD1507173891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1555 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Glod and Aleksandr Kryzanovskiy]

[Text] Minsk, 15 Jul (TASS)—The press conference held today by Nina Andreyeva's political adviser, Aleksandr Lapin, again confirmed that representatives of the Bolshevik Platform in the CPSU, which registered as an organization at an all-Union conference which has ended in the Belorussian capital, remain loyal "to true socialism, which was built in the Soviet Union before Nikita Khrushchev came to power."

One could distinctly sense in Aleksandr Lapin's replies a nostalgia for the old times, for iron discipline and firm order.

Answering the question of why there are so few workers among the people's deputies, they gave three reasons: "glasnost, democracy, and pluralism."

Speaking of how the Bolshevik Platform intends to voice the interests of the working class in practice, Lapin stated the intention of striving for the resignation of the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and then of working "to restore everything that has been destroyed over the past six years."

On the eve of the press conference in which she took no part, Nina Andreyeva told journalists that "the civil war unleashed in the Baltics and Caucasus by the ruling elite in the CPSU and USSR has been exacerbated by Yeltsin's coming to presidential power and the establishment in Russia of a right-wing authoritarian dictatorship of a profascist type." "The Slavs—Russians, Belorussians, and Ukrainians—should undertake the main responsibility for preventing previous heroic efforts by Bolsheviks from being destroyed."

"The CPSU will undoubtedly come over to our platform and free itself of the renegades and degenerates who are bringing the party into disrepute. After all, the situation is developing in such a way that if the counterrevolution triumphs, all-out civil war will break out in a year's time," noted Nina Andreyeva. "It is, for the moment, impossible, since the social basis of counterrevolution has not been formed. But the basis of anticommunism is taking shape, much encouraged from above. If we let the moment slip we will be signing the death sentences of socialism, October 1917, and the international working-class and communist movement," she noted.

PRAVDA has given a fundamental assessment of the standpoint of supporters of the Bolshevik Platform, writing that "for them (supporters of Nina Andreyeva), it is as if the realities of the time do not exist—as long as 'principles' triumph. They wish to exploit the contradictions of the present difficult situation to stir up an atmosphere of mutual distrust within the party." These words caused an avalanche of reproaches from the press conference's organisers aimed at all the mass media.

Official's Corruption, Greed Criticized

LD1507184191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1200 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Review of the Weeklies" by Anatoliy Kudryavtsev]

[Text] An article in the same issue No. 23 of STOLITSA, entitled "Measure Theft in Georgadzes," continues the theme of morality, or rather immorality, in politics. It deals with a comparatively unrenowned party and government functionary of the recent past, Georgadze, who used to be secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. His signature used to adorn the numerous decrees about the award of government decorations. The author of the article, Aleksandr Portnov, quotes from DOSYE 02, a monthly publication issued by Altay Kray executive committee and the Kray organization of the Union of Journalists.

According to the DOSYE, safes containing precious rings, diamonds, gold bars and large amounts of money in rubles and foreign currency were found in the cellars of Georgadze's private palace. Priceless treasures stolen from the storerooms of the Moscow Kremlin, the Hermitage, and the Historical Museum, including canvasses by Leonardo da Vinci, Rubens, and Van Dyck, were also kept there, the monthly DOSYE-02 writes.

The author of the article in STOLITSA, Aleksandr Portnov, concerns himself with the actual value of the stolen property. As a result of calculations and estimates, which we omit here, he draws the conclusion that, in the wake of Pavlov's reform, these treasures would be worth 5 or 6 billion [currency not specified].

The author of the article suggests that the immorality of top-ranking state functionaries and the level of their corruption should be measured on a special scale of units which, he suggests, should be called Georgadzes. In other words, 1 Georgadze would be worth about 3 billion rubles. To help appreciate the true size of this sum, 3 billion, the author explains that it is equal to the total annual spending, allocated from the USSR budget, for dealing with the aftermath of the Chernobyl catastrophe for millions of people living in an area three times the size of Bulgaria. It is equivalent to the cost of building houses for all the Soviet Army officers who used to be stationed in Germany, or building a new motorway from Moscow to Simferopol.

Naturally, Aleksandr Portnov continues, it is not possible to amass a single Georgadze without a refined system of thieving. Such a system exists even now, but it is deeply shrouded in secrecy. Only occasionally does the extreme tip of the gigantic iceberg, the system of mafia-controlled partocracy created by the true masters of the USSR, surface quite by accident, concludes Aleksandr Portnov [break in transmission] in the weekly STOLITSA.

MVD Official Cited on Organized Crime

LD1207100391

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 0915 GMT on 11 July broadcasts a 11-minute report by Aleksandr Gurov, head of the sixth administration of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], on the fight against the most dangerous crimes, organized crime, and corruption. He begins by complaining that the Ministry of Internal Affairs has insufficient people for crime fighting, even in the sixth, the main administration. Two years ago 32 people were provided for the administration. This was then ultimately raised to 84 members of staff for the whole country.

Following the presidential decree ten interregional administrations have been set up with ten republics this year. Gurov complains of resistance to the setting up of these adminstrations, especially in Uzbekistan, where the center of organized crime is now located. He goes on to say: "The president is in favor, but a certain Gusev exists there. I mention this name especially. He is a former member of staff of the Militia Department of Combating the Misappropriation of Socialist Property and Speculation, whom for certain reasons we did not employ to work in our administration. Finally—I shall not talk about these reasons—finally, he went there. In a word, he was appointed deputy minister of the Minstry of Internal Affairs of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic. He raises these issues, raises issues to stop this subunit from existing. What is more, he provokes other ministries to do the same. The question arises: Who stands to gain from this?"

Gurov then says that 2.7 million crimes have been registered. He refers to U.S. warnings that if the Soviets continue to allow the mafia to increase at this rate, the mafia will start to hamper political life as well. At the present time there are 5,000 organized crime groups known to the internal affairs bodies. Gurov says that 24,000 people have been murdered, and as many have been attacked.

According to USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs data cited in screen captions, it is forecast that 3-3.4 million crimes will be committed in 1991. The annual volume of the shadow economy's operations in 1991 is estimated at being 110-130 billion rubles. Gurov says that according to the most modest estimates this figure will grow to 170-200 billion rubles in the next few years. In combined operations with the KGB 1,600 crime groups have been exposed who committed more than 7,000 serious crimes. More than 530 groupings have inter-regional ties, and 56 have ties with corruption.

The video also features two reports over video of robbery with violence perpetrated on taxi passengers in Tashkent and the digging up of large sums of buried money obtained by bribes in Minsk.

High Kolkhoz Prices Show 'Mafia in Full Control'

PM1507111191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[ROSTASS report under the "Prices and People" rubric: "No Change in the Markets"]

[Text] Prices in kolkhoz markets have increased threefold, on average, over the past year. Their rare uniformity has now been established. Whereas previously markets could be divided into expensive and inexpensive markets, the impression is now created that the mafia is in full control of the situation and that all private producers have been forced to trade at the unified high prices dictated by it.

Take, for purposes of comparison, three markets: the Central, the Dorogomilovo, and the Leningradskiy. A visit to them, as well as to any others, is not recommended for those of a nervous disposition. There is plenty everywhere you look, but for whom? Neither an average wage nor compensation will suffice even for a single day if you live on fresh produce from these trade centers. At the same time the empty and scantily stocked counters in stores—both meat and dairy stores and vegetable stores—drive housewives to these "hotbeds" of speculation, where meat costs, on average, 30-40 rubles [R] per kg, chickens R30 each, and eggs R8-12 for 10. Here radishes cost between 60 kopeks and R1, onions (literally three or four bits of greenery) cost R1, and currants and strawberries cost R15-20 per kg. There is no point in continuing....

But since wholesale purchases by the Moscow City Main Administration for the Fruit and Vegetable Industry are very minimal and leave no particular illusions, a drop in prices as the markets are saturated with produce also cannot be expected.

At the same time it is hard to censure rural inhabitants for trading in the market, because a pood of hay today costs R10, and a kilogram of mixed feed 77 kopeks. You cannot buy planting stock, and seeds and fertilizers have risen substantially in price.

"But there must be a limit to this!" exclaims another victim who has gone to the market and come away empty-handed from this den of high prices.

Alas, as long as the mafia dictates the laws here and as long as the state is unable to regularize the population's food supply, the absence of limits on the setting of prices in kolkhoz markets will invariably continue.

Explosion Damages Gryazovets-Moscow Gas Pipeline

LD1507222291 Moscow TASS in English 1833 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] Yaroslavl July 15 TASS—An explosion near the village of Nekrasovskoye damaged six meters of the Gryazovets-Moscow circle gas pipline. The fire destroyed nearly one hectare of forest. Luckily, there were no casualties.

A special rescue service that was recently set up at the fire-fighting administration helped localize the fire.

Reasons for the gas leakage and explosion are being investigated.

TASS Reviews 16 Jul Soviet Press

LD1607075191 Moscow TASS in English 0640 GMT 16 Jul 91

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS—Russia's expanded legislature failed to elect a parliament speaker for the fourth time on Monday, newspapers report today.

Sergey Baburin won 448 votes, Ruslan Khasbulatov got 404 votes and Yuriy Yarov—74. Neither of the candidates managed to get the 531 votes needed to be elected.

Newspapers focus on the group of seven industrialized nations in London and President Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming arrival there. The PRAVDA story about the summit is headlined "Seven Plus One".

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA carries on page one Gorbachev's greetings to participants in a telemarathon "War veterans for peace and democracy".

The political literature publishers have released a new book comprising materials about Gorbachev's visit to Norway and Sweden on June 5 and 6, PRAVDA reports.

PRAVDA reports the completion of talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker in Washington. The talks focused on three technical problems blocking a strategic arms reduction treaty.

The talks were "very serious and tense", Bessmertnykh told Soviet reporters.

The two also discussed regional problems, incuding the Middle East, Iraq and Afghanistan. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA carries an interview with Aleksandr Bessmertnykh.

PRAVDA reports new Soviet efforts to procure at least 77 million tons of grain this year.

The newspaper carries interviews with Ukrainian Parliament Chairman L. Kravchuk and Deputy Belorussian Parliament Chairman V. Sholodonov, who comment on the new Union treaty.

PRAVDA comments on Aleksandr Yakovlev's recent article in IZVESTIYA.

PRAVDA carries documents by writer Lazar Karelin about the Soviet Communist Party. "To think that our country can do without the CPSU is to be in a state of thoughtlessness. The party will not be overthrown, it can only clean and renew itself," Karelin believes.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA comments on unemployment among Soviet engineers.

TRUD writes about relations between Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia.

It also covers an international seminar on illegal drug plants growing, which opens in Kazakhstan today.

The seminar will be attended by experts from South East Asia, America and Western Europe.

Other stories focus on developments in Yugoslavia and other countries.

Economic

Yavlinskiy Interviewed on Economic Crisis

AU1507163591 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 15 Jul 91 pp 121-122

[Interview with Grigoriy Yavlinskiy, head of the independent "Center for Economic and Political Research" in Moscow, reform economist, and "unofficial adviser" to Gorbachev and Yeltsin, by an unnamed DER SPIEGEL journalist; place and date not given: "Opportunity for Building a Bridge"]

[Text] [DER SPIEGEL] Grigoriy Alekseyevich, what is the program that your President Gorbachev will present at the London international economic summit?

[Yavlinskiy] It is probably not yet certain whether he wants to present a reform program or simply deliver a political message. Many things will be decided at the last moment.

[DER SPIEGEL] What should he do, in your view?

[Yavlinskiy] It would be beneficial to all if we presented a clear program to which the seven could reply with yes or no. The worst thing would be if everything remained in a haze again.

[DER SPIEGEL] Why should the West pump between $130 and $150 billion dollars into the economically bankrupt Soviet Union over the next five years?

[Yavlinskiy] It should not. Only if the Soviet Union is able to give assurances that at least 95 percent of the money will flow back, the risk for the West could be judged accurately. Such a democratic and market-oriented USSR could fundamentally change the world situation.

[DER SPIEGEL] You have cautioned that the "crumbling" of the Soviet state, with unpredictable consequences, is imminent if the West does not help. This sounds more like blackmail than a new way of thinking.

[Yavlinskiy] This may well be. But this does not come from me, but from the Americans with whom I worked out the reform program. In the West there are enough analysts who are able to judge our situation precisely.

[DER SPIEGEL] Henry Kissinger thinks that there are still no preconditions whatsoever that will lead the West to agree to the "grand bargain"—the Soviet Union is not yet ready for real change.

[Yavlinskiy] Who would have predicted four years ago that there would be free elections in our country or that the last Soviet soldier would have withdrawn from eastern Europe? Our program is only one link in a chain of important events. It is the opportunity for building a bridge between East and West.

[DER SPIEGEL] Western aid should already start this autumn?

[Yavlinskiy] We have done nothing but talk for much too long. Now there are first concrete approaches: The Soviet Union will become an associate member of the IMF. We are already thinking of how we can reduce both social expenditure and the budget deficit as quickly as possible and, at the same time, liberalize prices. If we received help for that now, this would make our situation considerably easier. This would not cost the West too much—far less than it has pumped into our country so far.

[DER SPIEGEL] The West thinks more of help to help yourselves. What can your country really do at the moment?

[Yavlinskiy] The first step would be an honest demilitarization of the economy. Gorbachev wants to illustrate this in London very graphically. This is already a revolution: If anyone had proposed five years ago that western experts should participate in the conversion of our arms companies, he would have ended up in the lunatic asylum immediately.

[DER SPIEGEL] But there has been talk of conversion for a long time now.

[Yavlinskiy] We are already producing pots in tank factories. However, in order to prevent the same machines from being used to produce tanks again soon, we need direct cooperation with the West in this field.

[DER SPIEGEL] How is the sensible use of western aid to be ensured?

[Yavlinskiy] There will be a control institution for this purpose. Otherwise there could be no cooperation with the World Bank and the IMF.

[DER SPIEGEL] The "agent of world imperialism," as the orthodox communists call you, is speaking here.

[Yavlinskiy] When they say that, I always ask them whether they could manage to do without western products—from pharmaceuticals to grain.

[DER SPIEGEL] Can an economy that has permitted its production goods to rot for generations and is lagging far behind in technology recover within only six to seven years?

[Yavlinskiy] What would have happened to me if I had written a program for 100 years? Many people mocked the 500-day program that was drawn up last year. Now the issue is six years. During these six years the economy is to be improved, but it is not supposed to achieve the level of West Germany. Such a goal would be absurd. We simply need an upswing.

[DER SPIEGEL] You are calling for national consensus on your reform—but there is not even agreement on currency issues.

[Yavlinskiy] If the issue were only national symbols, this would not be particularly bad. Then the Ukrainians could print their president or a national hero on their own banknotes without any problems. If one really wants a central bank, which decides on all currency issues on its own, one should not speak of a union, but only of a confederation at best.

[DER SPIEGEL] By having their own currencies, the Baltic republics wanted to achieve convertibility faster than has been possible in the case of the ruble so far. Now the Union Cabinet has surprised everyone with the plan to make the ruble convertible as early as of 1 January 1992.

[Yavlinskiy] Convertibility depends directly on the export possibilities of each republic. One would have to ask the Baltic states what and to where they want to export so quickly. By the way: I doubt very much that we can make our ruble convertible by the end of the year, as Prime Minister Pavlov plans. Without a stabilization fund, for which Western aid would again be needed, this does not work.

[DER SPIEGEL] Will the Soviet state, which is already very much in debt, not try repeatedly to take the major part of foreign currency from enterprises and private persons?

[Yavlinskiy] What does "the state" mean? Concerning all reform steps, there is the question of who guides them. At their own request, the republics will approve a joint economic committee and this is where policy will be worked out.

[DER SPIEGEL] Those who join neither the Union treaty nor the economic union—how do they get Russian crude oil or Ukrainian grain?

[Yavlinskiy] This will be decided by those who belong to these bodies. On the one hand, people who live there are not completely foreign to us. On the other hand, they have isolated themselves from the Union—by customs barriers and their own currency. In this respect, any kind of extremism—be it because of ambitions to achieve sovereignty or ambitions to be a superpower—is inappropriate. Relations that benefit all parties involved must develop gradually.

[DER SPIEGEL] Do the defecting Baltic states also see the issue in this way?

[Yavlinskiy] I have talked to the leading Baltic politicians. They understand this idea.

[DER SPIEGEL] And how do you want to settle the question of property between the central government, the republics, and the enterprises?

[Yavlinskiy] The property law has been in force for one year and it contains quite a lot of explosive matter with regard to such a division. All property must be handed over to private persons. Regarding raw materials, in Germany no one thinks about whether the coal belongs to the federal government or to the laender. Those who produce it pay taxes—and this settles everything. The discussion of whether our diamonds belong to Russia or to Yakutia does not lead anywhere.

[DER SPIEGEL] Can the necessary market economy laws be passed by the current, very conservative Supreme Soviet or must a new parliament be formed first?

[Yavlinskiy] Now we even have a president who could make the correct decisions without parliament.

[DER SPIEGEL] Do you think that the "homo sovieticus", with his fear of independent responsibility and his fatalism, is the appropriate person to implement your market reforms?

[Yavlinskiy] If one just thinks of how much strength, imagination, and courage the people in this country had to have all these years to survive and not to spend their lives behind bars, one realizes that this was good training. There were some first-class achievements made in this intellectual, political, and economic prison—in space research, in armaments, and to a certain extent in medicine too.

[DER SPIEGEL] But these were rather isolated cases.

[Yavlinskiy] That depends on your point of view. We get 60 percent of all potatoes from peasants who have only a small plot of land and who do not even have the necessary technical equipment. And these are people who constantly have to live with the fear of being dragged in front of a court or being deprived of their small income. When this finally stops, and private property is protected—what will they then be able to achieve!

[DER SPIEGEL] But first of all they need money.

[Yavlinskiy] If the World Bank or the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development establishes a fund to promote entrepreneurship, there will not only be loans, but also practical help. I am convinced that the people will work then. Perhaps not as much as in Switzerland, but this is not the issue at all —however, first of all they have to be given the freedom to do so.

[DER SPIEGEL] Critics abroad say that the biggest disadvantage of your plan is its radical nature. Is Prime Minister Pavlov's program not more pleasant for the Soviet citizens?

[Yavlinskiy] Of course this may be the case. The present government should decide once and for all what is more radical: exchanging ruble banknotes overnight, without sense and reason, and raising the prices to three times their original value, or really implementing a radical reform program. Radical stupidity is obviously acceptable, but not radical change.

Gosbank Chairman on Centralized Bank Controls

PM1507123791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

[USSR Gosbank Chairman V. Gerashchenko article: "Union Treaty from Banker's Viewpoint"]

[Text] The draft Treaty on the Union of Sovereign States, published a few days ago, certainly cannot fail to elicit approval. Although, of course, like everything in our world, it is not ideal. Many of its provisions will be rendered more precise in the course of developing new structures and mechanisms for the country's management. And yet there is one point in the draft which needs to be corrected or, if you like, rendered more precise without delay, for otherwise we will never succeed in arranging the working of the national economy.

It is a question of the system of central banks. It falls within the sphere of joint Union and republic jurisdiction, and the emission of money alone is the prerogative of the Union authorities.

At first sight everything is reasonable here. And the leadership of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] has never laid claim to a monopoly on the truth. It was no coincidence that the recently adopted Law on the USSR Gosbank bluntly stated that the country's central bank must be managed by a council which will include, in addition to the chairman and his deputy who are appointed by the USSR Supreme Soviet, also representatives of the republics.

However, it follows from this that decisions in the sphere of credit and banking policy, which are adopted collectively and with regard for a majority of votes, become binding on all the republics. But the draft Union treaty proposes a quite different system.

In accordance with Article 7, questions relating to "...the sphere of the joint competence of Union and republic organs remain within the republics' jurisdiction and are implemented by them independently or on the basis of bilateral and multilateral agreements among them." Moreover, Article 11 clearly states that "a republic's laws reign supreme on its territory with regard to all questions except those within the Union's jurisdiction."

All this promises us a lengthy debate and lengthy negotiations on every question of credit and banking policy. And the central bank's activity will be altogether paralyzed, as disagreement on the part of any republic with regard to any question becomes an insoluble problem. Therefore I have no doubt that, given the unified ruble, everything relating to the activity of the country's banking system must be within the Union's jurisdiction. I will repeat, however, that the central bank will be managed by a council of the republics' representatives.

Maybe this will strike some people as a violation of the republics' sovereignty, but then let us turn to foreign experience. J. Delors, president of the EC Commission, visited our country recently and addressed a session of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers—incidentally, IZVESTIYA (issue No. 147) published a report on this. So, he declared that in the EEC an ever increasing number of questions are being resolved by a majority of votes and not by a full consensus. Particularly where a high degree of integration has been achieved. Otherwise tiny Luxembourg or the Netherlands, let us say, could cancel out a decision advantageous to the entire community.

And yet the unified ruble is the highest degree of integration imaginable. And it is simply criminal to permit disorder and vacillation in this sphere. And this is not only my viewpoint. I am prepared to renounce it if even one prominent and authoritative foreign banker advocates the republics' independent implementation of money and credit policy.

I realize that it is not that simple now to make any changes to the draft treaty which was worked out with such difficulty in Novo-Ogarevo. But there is another way out: Simultaneously with signing this important document, conclude an agreement among the republics—at the level of heads of sovereign states and with subsequent ratification by parliaments—on the creation of a system of USSR central banks with a single management organ for the whole system. Only the Central Council of this system could implement a sensible banking policy.

Coal Ministry, Miners Sign Agreement

LD1207201691 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1900 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Text] The Soviet Coal Ministry and the national Miners' Union have signed a tariff agreement for 1991-92. The agreement provides for a double pay rise until the end of the year, minimal social security guarantees, and a 30-hour working week to become enforced from 1 January. It also envisages measures for work safety, health service and one year's pay for the families of the victims.

Metal Workers Union Calls for 'United Actions'

PM1507103391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 11 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Call to Action"]

[Text] The Trade Union Federation of Workers in the USSR Mining and Metallurgical Industry (the "Soyuzmetal" Trade Union Center) has called on the sector's workers to mark 19 July—Metallurgists' Day—with united actions in defense of their social rights.

In view of the crisis situation in the metallurgical industry and the mounting social tensions, the trade union center proposes to hold collective actions—meetings, demonstrations, and solidarity rallies—on the day. "Let us act in a united front in order to achieve a retooling of the sector and better living and working conditions for metal workers from the Union and republic governments, ministries, concerns, and other associations," the "Soyuzmetal" appeal to all member-organizations states.

The trade union center insists that during the sector's entry into the market workers should be guaranteed employment, restrictions on wages should be lifted, and problems of low-profit and unprofitable enterprises should be resolved fairly. Other demands include a reduction of the working week to 40 hours, and to 35 hours for people working in hard or harmful conditions.

Oil Fetches High Prices at Tyumen Auction

PM1507122991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jul 91 Union Edition p 2

[Yuriy Perepletkin report under the "Direct Link" rubric: "Oil the Most Marketable Commodity"]

[Text] Tyumen—The first auction has taken place in Tyumen Commodity and Stock Exchange. The total deals exceeded 51 million rubles [R].

Very diverse commodities were put up for sale, including motor vehicles and machine tools, bricks and all sorts of timber, even tourist passes and champagne. Oil proved the most marketable commodity. Sellers offered this raw material for sale in lots of 2,000-5,000 tonnes 20 times, and it was all sold. Prices varied, but a tonne of oil went for an average of R380 (this is almost six times what the state pays West Siberian producers).

Broker's places were also auctioned. And whereas such a place cost R250,000-500,000 a few months ago, when the exchange was being set up, people are now paying R800,000-900,000 for one. And one was even sold for R1.1 million.

The next auction will take place 17 July. Specialists today tentatively estimate the value of the commodities on offer at R1 billion.

Tank Car Plant Halted by Supply Shortages

PM1507124991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by G. Kondaurov, identified by caption, from Mariupol's Azovmash plant]

[Text] The transition to the market is particularly difficult for our country's giant plants such as Uralmash, the Novokramatorsk machine building plant, and Azovmash, for example. They employ many thousands of workers. And production of essential output has declined sharply because the old mechanism has been disrupted but the new mechanism is not operating yet.

Our correspondent reports from the Azovmash plant in Mariupol.

[Kondaurov] The country's only tank car production line has ground to a halt. There is no metal, no wheels, no axles, and other components necessary for the assembly of tank cars and open-top freight cars. Many people are without work. Naming the culprits would mean listing thousands of Azovmash suppliers from Vladivostok to Riga. Economic ties between republics and regions have been disrupted. However, all the republics need tank cars. Our vast country cannot function without them. After all, tank cars mean petroleum, gasoline, construction materials, mineral fertizers, chemicals, and much else.

The country needs twice as many tank cars as Azovmash is capable of producing. Yet the production line has been at a standstill for a week. This has further exacerbated the acute shortage of rolling stock.

[USSR People's Deputy A.Ye. Antifeyev, director general, identified by caption] In my opinion, so we can operate normally and supply the country steadily with fuel transportation facilities, we ought to be receiving rolled metal and components under the state order system. We know that Premier Pavlov wants to keep the state order small. But this is a strategic area. And the state must exercise special control over strategic areas and create a special system to ensure that this work is not disrupted.

We foresaw some decline in the production of tank cars, so we went for the production of a product which requires less metal. This is our container-tank. You can see it here. It's virtually in series production now.

[Kondaurov] The production of this container-tank does not require wheels, axles, and so forth. These containers can be transported by rail, road, ship, aircraft, and helicopter. The market has prompted Azovmash to develop a very good new product. But for the time being it is incapable of supplying the plant with half a million tonnes of metal for the production of output which is of fundamental importance for the national economy. Who will do so now that the State Planning Committee and the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply no longer exist?

Agricultural

Official Comments on Harvest Prospects

LD1507211791

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian at 1800 GMT on 15 July, in the scheduled "Vremya" newscast, carries a four-minute interview with Mikhail Lukich Timoshishin, described as chairman of the USSR State Committee for Purchases of Food Resources, by a correspondent who is not identified.

The correspondent first notes that the per capita consumption of bread in the USSR is 131 kg a year. He then begins interviewing Timoshishin, who says that "in many regions of the country the situation this year is not conducive to good harvest. At the same time, the gross grain harvest is expected to be in the range of 200 million tonnes."

Replying to a question about what needs to be done to increase purchases, the speaker recalls the government decision of 12 July, aimed at stimulating additional purchases of grain from state and collective farms and other producers: up to 30 percent of state-ordered grain can now be sold at contractual prices. He recalls what the decision has to say. Answering exactly how much grain will be bought from the West, Timoshishin says: "As a specialist and a manager, I can say that, indeed, apparently this year we will not be able to do without the West, without buying imported grain. I would like to clarify the information put out in the "Vremya" program yesterday, when it was said that the state intends to buy up to 80 million tonnes of imported grain. I think that the real figure...." At this point the announcer presses a button terminating the interview and says: "I nevertheless think that we cannot resolve all our problems by foreign purchases and financial assistance from the West. The ways of running the economy which are obsolete and which for decades have failed to justify themselves must be changed. Farms must be given more independence and then the results will not be slow in coming."

Cabinet Incentives to Grain Producers Welcomed

PM1607094391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

["Direct Line" report by Mikhail Petrov: "Cabinet of Ministers: A New Way of Getting the Grain"]

[Text] Moscow—The USSR Cabinet of Ministers has adopted a resolution "On Measures To Ensure Coordinated Actions by Union and Republic Organs in Forming State Grain Resources From the 1991 Harvest."

There is no need to remind you what a laborious process it was to fill the "homeland's granaries" last year. And that was when we had an unprecedented harvest! This year it is forecast that the gross grain harvest will be 185-195 million tonnes. That is 23-33 million tonnes less than last year. And grain procurements could be a mere 60-65 million tonnes, but even that quantity will be difficult to purchase.

In these conditions efficient, coordinated actions by all republics in implementing the state grain order—77 million tonnes—are absolutely vital. Incidentally, representatives of republic governments had previously discussed the draft document in detail and made the requisite additions.

The resolution determines pretty resolute measures to encourage grain producers. Republic governments will make up to 10 percent of market stocks of automobiles, home appliances, clothes (right down to socks), footwear, and construction materials available for sale in exchange for grain.

This year agricultural enterprises will buy mixed feed in exchange for sales of grain at prices reduced by 30 percent. It has been decided that the price difference will be paid out of the budget.

Like last year, hard currency grain and oil seed purchases will be made using resources released at the beginning of the year for the acquisition of grain abroad. Moreover, the State Committee for Food Resources Purchases has been allocated 1 billion rubles from the USSR president's reserve fund in order to conduct procurements successfully.

Incidentally, many provisions in the document reproduce almost exactly points in the Russian Government's ordinance adopted last Friday. These decisions are clearly important and timely. Since the quest for funds that would make it possible to get the grain in today's grim conditions, and, consequently, improve the agro-industrial complex economy as well has inevitably led to the determined introduction of market mechanisms.

Kyrgyz Harvest Prospects Said 'Very Poor'

PM1507123591 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Report by V. Fedorov, identified by caption, from Kyrgyzstan]

[Text] By the beginning of July 1.6 million hectares of grain had been cut and just over 1.2 million hectares had been threshed. That is only just over 50 percent of the area harvested by early-July last year. In many parts of the country, such as Kazakhstan and Orenburg Oblast, the crops have been scorched by the drought which is affecting the whole east of the country. So a state of emergency is being introduced in the agriculture of many republics and oblasts. Kyrgyzstan is no exception.

[Fedorov] If you tell anyone in Kyrgyzstan today that the Lenin Kolkhoz in Alamedinskiy Rayon is reaping just 5-6 quintals of grain [per hectare], they won't believe you. After all, this kolkhoz is well known for reaping more than 30 quintals per hectare in a good year even on this steeply sloping nonirrigated land, and 15 quintals during an average year. This year the yields are very poor. And this applies to the whole of the republic. In the spring damage was caused by frosts, and in the summer by drought. Especially in the Chu Valley, the republic's main grain-producing area.

The situation so far as motor fuel is concerned resembles a natural catastrophe. Transporting green feed to livestock units is a problem. A dangerous trend is emerging. Farms are reducing their livestock populations. The cattle herd has been reduced by 30,000 head, and almost 1.5 million sheep have been slaughtered.

Republic President Akayev himself took the scythe into his hands. Right here on this mountain meadow, he signed a decree introducing emergency measures during the feed procurement period and the harvest. They envisage mobilizing manpower, machinery, and material resources. On the whole the situation is not hopeless. The maximum effort must be made to harvest everything that has grown on irrigated land.

Grain Yield Expected To Drop 16-17 Percent

PM1507155391 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 p 1

[Feature compiled by Ye. Arakelyan, D. Dobrovolskiy, Yu. Lvov, Ye. Minlbayeva, V. Terekhina, and N. Tkacheva: "We Will Suffer the Harvest—We Will Live!"]

[Excerpts] Throughout the ages our peasants have called harvest time the suffering. They rejoiced at the grain, worshiped it, and prayed to it, but above all they suffered for grain, which was life, and thus, also for life itself.

We have not worshiped grain for a long time. And instead of suffering for it, we do not even know how to sow it and harvest what was sown in time on a countrywide scale.

Today the farmer wages the "battle for the harvest" not so much against the capricious weather but against his own harvest, which belongs to the whole people....

But the truth remains that our grain is our life. This means we have to suffer together.

We will suffer the harvest—and we will begin to live?

Forecast

A. Strashnaya, head of a department of the USSR Hydrometeorological Center:

"The drought which has gripped the southern Urals, North Kazakhstan, some rayons of Novosibirsk Oblast and Altay Kray, and a large territory of Omsk and Tyumen Oblasts will reduce the grain crops harvest in those places by 20-30 percent compared with last year. According to specialists' forecasts, this will reduce the country's gross grain yield by 16-17 percent.

"In Moldova wheat and barley have lodged over an area of 10,000 hectares following torrential rain. Approximately one-half of what was sown will be lost owing to harvesting difficulties. A similar picture is also to be observed in the Western Ukraine.

"Cotton crops in Uzbekistan have suffered from mudflows.

"The situation is far better in the European part of Russia—here the weather conditions have so far been favorable to grain growers."

L. Vashchukov, chief of the Statistics Administration of the Union Agro-Industrial Complex:

"This year, as last year, grain crops occupy approximately 110 million hectares. Although, if you compare this with 1985, the crop area has diminished by 2-3 million hectares. Fewer industrial crops will be cultivated —flax, cotton, sugar beets..." [passage omitted]

Supply worker A. Bondarev:

This year the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has resolved to send 30,000 Army vehicles to Russia and 10,000 to Kazakhstan to transport grain.

"The situation is alarming," A. Bondarev, agricultural supply chief specialist, said, "and the main difficulties are not even with the billeting of servicemen but with the fuel shortage. Things are more or less good only with diesel fuel. But the majority of motor transport battalion trucks run on gasoline. If the Army sends 'gasoline' trucks, both they and the collective farm equipment will come to a halt..." [passage omitted]

Kyrgyzstan—A state of emergency has been announced in gathering the harvest in the republic. President A. Akayev went out to cut grass with scythe in hand.

The Kuban—mass reaping is in full swing. Grain has been cut on 700,000 out of 1.6 million hectares and threshed on 552,000 hectares. The yield per hectare is at least 25 percent lower than last year.

Fire Poses Threat to Nikolayev Oblast Harvest

PM1507160191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1200 GMT 12 Jul 91

[From the "Television News Service" newscast: Report by I. Petkov, identified by caption, from Nikolayev Oblast]

[Text] [Petkov] The harvest is beginning in Nikolayev Oblast, a major grain-growing region. Unfortunately the hum of the engines was almost immediately interrupted by breakdowns of the worn-out combines, which are suffering from spare part shortages. God forbid that a spark ignites the bone-dry crops in the 45 degrees of heat registered here today, especially as on one in two machines the fire extinguishers are not working.

Fire service flying squads are racing through the oblast's fields, recording not just the presence or absence of fire extinguishers, water trucks, and special vehicles. Some of the trucks servicing the combines do not even carry an ordinary bucket and shovel.

So what does one of the organizers of the oblast's fire prevention service make of this situation?

[S.I. Shulmin, fire prevention service inspector, identified by caption] I am stunned by people's complacency. No fines can help here.

Military Allocates 30,000 Vehicles for Harvest

LD1507164391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1100 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] The USSR Defense Ministry has assigned 30,000 motor vehicles to help farmers. These have been allocated throughout 20 oblasts and krays of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. This news is cited in a summary consistent with the spirit of a report on combat actions. It has been posted on a stand in the foyer of the Great Kremlin Palace where a sitting of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies is underway. A number of vehicle battalions have already entered the battle for the harvest in Stavropol Kray and Volgograd Oblast. The remainder are advancing in concentration regions, the summary by the USSR Defense Ministry reports.

Army Short of Drivers

PM1607090191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Troops and the Harvest"]

[Text] These days troop subunits are being actively enlisted in transporting newly harvested grain. A TASS correspondent was told by Colonel General V.F. Popov, chief of the USSR Defense Ministry Main Motor Vehicle Directorate, that, by decision of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, the Defense Ministry is sending 80 motorized battalions to bring in the harvest—60 to the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and 20 to northern oblasts of Kazakhstan.

The lessons of last year's harvest have in many respects been learned this year, and a new principle of manning troop subunits is being practiced particularly insistently. The crux of this principle is to ensure that, until the end of the harvest, trucks are manned by drafted reservists, albeit within the limits of the sovereign republic—the RSFSR. Reason would seem to have prevailed—that was what the USSR Cabinet of Ministers resolution said. However, changes set in from the very outset of the work. When the troop trains carrying the trucks were unloaded, Tambov, Saratov, Belgorod, and certain other oblasts refused to accept them. One condition was imposed: We will not accept the troop trains if the equipment is not fully manned with drivers.

When implementing the USSR Defense Ministry order, the troops exhausted all their opportunities to recruit military drivers to bring in the harvest. Only 12 motorized battalions are 100-percent manned with drivers. The rest have only succeeded in acquiring one driver per four trucks. This is no whim on our part, V.F. Popov noted. Tremendous undermanning, particularly as regards drivers, has been recorded in the Army due to the disruption of the draft in some regions of the country last fall and this spring. It has therefore been decided to draft 280 people for every battalion in the oblasts where they will work, and the rest from other oblasts of the RSFSR.

Yavlinskiy Meets With Republic Leaders

PM1507154991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 p 1

["According to Rumors and Authoritatively" report by A. Korzun: "Big Maneuvers"]

[Text] At the Lithuanian Republic's permanent mission in Moscow we were told that V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, returned to Vilnius yesterday after completing his two-day talks with deputies of the European Parliament in Strasbourg.

Many news agencies in the world note the remark that V. Landsbergis made in France to the effect that the Soviet Union is still in a state of "cold war" with the Baltic republics.

Despite this statement by V. Landsbergis, the interest of the republics which have declared their independence in preserving economic ties with the USSR is still significant.

At Estonia's permanent mission in Moscow the day before yesterday Grigoriy Yavlinskiy met with Anatolijs Gorbunovs, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, Gediminas Vagnorius, prime minister of Lithuania, and Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet. The high-ranking representatives discussed the possibility of the Baltic republics' participation in the implementation of reforms in the Soviet Union with the author of the "Window of Opportunity" economic program.

Sergey Zverev, G. Yavlinskiy's aide, told us that the meeting was of an unofficial nature: "Yavlinskiy was representing only himself, and there was no one standing behind him."

We have learned from well informed sources that the residence of Boris Yeltsin, Russia's first president, has not only squeezed Union power in the Kremlin. Yeltsin himself has occupied Room 1 in Block 14, on which only quite recently the nameplate "USSR President M.S. Gorbachev" hung.

Not that the "senior president" has suffered—these are not the only apartments belonging to Gorbachev in the Kremlin.

Estonia

Ruutel Receives FRG Group, Departs For U.S.

LD1507213291 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1400 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] Today, at Kadriorg, Arnold Ruutel, chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, received a Bundestag delegation from the FRG headed by Dr. Woldgang von Stetten. The German parliamentary members arrived in Tallinn yesterday having previously visited Lithuania and Latvia. This afternoon the visitors had a meeting at the Estonian Foreign Ministry.

Arnold Ruutel received also Jack Gosnell, U.S. consul general in Leningrad, on his first visit to Tallinn today. Various political and economic issues were discussed. The U.S. diplomat was also received by Ulo Nugis, speaker of the Supreme Soviet.

Tonight Arnold Ruutel will leave for the United States to attend the Special Olympic Games in Minneapolis as a guest of honor.

Minister Details Results of Siberian Tour

LD1507170591 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1700 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Text] As you know the Estonian Government delegation's Siberian tour came to an end yesterday. When talking about the results of the tour an opinion has been expressed that the government will make Estonia bare of consumer goods and foodstuffs when trading with Siberia. Aleksander Sikkal, minister of material resources has given an interview to this program.

[Begin Sikkal recording] The aim of our Siberian tour was to acquaint ourselves first and foremost with the possibilities existing in the three important regions of Siberia: that is, Krasnoyarsk Kray, Irkutsk Oblast and Sverdlovsk Oblast. What would be the opportunities for us, within the framework of the now existing economic treaty between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Estonia, to make our economic links more specific with precisely those specific regions. In addition we also agreed on a whole string of general principles upon which this kind of a regional trade should take place.

Well, those principles are first and foremost, well, the fact that the basis for value within this regional trade should be world market prices; that trade should take place at contractual prices; and the trade with those regions should be balanced. In addition we also spoke about a whole string of areas for cooperation which are of interest to both sides. We determined the possible list of goods for trade between the regions; also possible quantities taking into account the economic potential of either region; but I would like to say that the main work still lies ahead, at the level of businesses.

The main achievement, however, of the tour was to have created favorable conditions for both our enterprises to do business in those Siberian areas as well as for Siberian enterprises to do business in Estonia. We largely dispersed the impression of our economic radicalism or attempts at isolating ourselves. Those areas are very important to us, and not only because of their raw material resources, such as forestry products, products of the chemical industry and products of the metallurgical industry, but also because of heavy mechanical engineering and heavy industry altogether in Siberia. The main job here will be that of bringing together the interests of our subjects of the economy—our enterprises and producers—with the republic's interests first and foremost, and [words indistinct] quite new forms of cooperation, perhaps with new mediators and mediating organizations which—as a result of combining all these interests—should bring into the republic everything that we will obtain from Siberia. If one takes a look at what is of interest to those areas in our economy then at a first glance it may indeed seem that the Estonian Government is planning to sell off all our consumer goods and foodstuffs to them. That is not so. I believe that as far as consumer goods are concerned then we produce them mainly from raw materials brought in from elsewhere. I would like to add at this point also that our tours around other regions and republics in the Union should definitely continue. I think that a visit to Central Asian republics should be a task for the near future, to resolve the issues of raw materials for our light industry in the interests of both the republic and light industry enterprises. This work must be continued intensively.

After our arrival I think that we will immediately start doing specific work with our enterprises. We will inform them of the conditions upon which it will be possible to exchange goods with those Siberian regions. We will suggest, well, specific quantities which they could obtain from those regions in the way of exchanging goods. Yet one must be aware of the fact that to obtain something one must also give something. We have been given fairly little time: During August and September we should already emerge with specific figures from below, at the enterprise level and then we will start trading with those Siberian regions on the basis of those, in conjunction with our enterprises. [end recording]

Ministers Comment on Shcherbakov Statement

OW1507100891 Moscow BALTFAX in English
1915 GMT 12 Jun 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Estonia's Minister for Material Resources Aleksandr Sikkalt described, in an interview to BALTFAX, as ungrounded allegations by Soviet Vice Premier Vladimir Shcherbakov that the Baltic republics buy oil, oil products, noferrous scrap metals at low prices and export them without licences. Shcherbakov said that at a press-conference in Moscow on July 11.

According to Sikkalt, the above products cannot be exported out of the USSR without licences as the Soviet customs continue to operate at the Baltic borders. He did not deny that such deals have been taking place but only "with consent of the respective Soviet agencies."

Commenting on Shcherbakov's statement that trade with the six republics unwilling to sign the Union Treaty should be in accordance with world prices beginning next October, Estonian Economy Minister Jaak Leimann said that this reform "would be very difficult to carry out." In his interview to the BALTFAX, he did not deny that with the introduction of world prices, Estonia faced great difficulties because of the shortage of fuel, in particular during the early stage. He said that the Estonian Government had already worked out a programme to cope with a possible energy crunch. According to Leimann, in the case of the "worst-case scenario", housing will be heated to 14 to 15 degrees Celcius, some of the residents will be evacuated, only the basic industries will be operating plus public transportation and emergency services (ambulances, police etc.). However, "this scenario can hardly become reality because of the possible reaction of the world public opinion".

Mayor Discusses Local Military Defense Plans

LD1207213191 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network
in Estonian 0900 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Correspondent Vello Laan interview with Otepaa Mayor Jaanus Raidal, in Otepaa; date not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Laan] Otepaa is probably going to be a model for the rest of Estonia, because the subject of setting up companies for young men in army service is being discussed. Government representatives, Kaitseliit and all those who have something to do with this, have been here. Mayor Jaanus Raidal, how are things developing?

[Raidal] This business started unfolding at the end of 1989 and the beginning of 1990, when abstract socialism was abolished in Otepaa, and when we started to create a policy of democratic reform. Also at that time labor service was born, which later took shape across the whole republic as alternative service. A year has passed since the alternative service was set up. In essence, labor service became a job bureau. It does not perhaps fulfil all the aims or missions which in fact it should, and Estonian men may in the future end up quite flabby and undisciplined people, as they say.

For about a year there has been talk across Estonia of the need for a defense army, if only because of those provocations and attacks which have taken place on the border, or because of the vandalism which may take place in [USSR] military units when they start to withdraw in the near future. We should be ready for all this. At the beginning of the year, we at the local council set up a special commission to draw up a conception for alternative service. By February it was ready. [passage omitted] The idea was also to start seeking money and equipment, and to have talks, first with the state—the republican—government. It is very pleasant to hear from them that they are also ready for this, and are waiting for the starting shot, which is what we have produced. So we have decided that the labor service in Otepaa will be turned into a militarized regime, in barracks, with exercises, as well as everything else, until a defense army for the whole republic is developed.

[Laan] Do barracks of this kind exist?

[Raidal] Yes, we have been holding talks with two organizations: Dunamo sports base, and [indistinct place name] sports base, which belongs to Kalev. Both sides have made positive offers, and barracks will not interfere with thier activities. Of course, with Dunamo, the issue is that one would not quite like to set up a military unit in a town, or to make it look as if there is another military stronghold about to be born in Estonia which brings the military right in the middle of a settlement, while [indistinct place name] is indeed a beauty spot. The young men would receive perhaps an aesthetic, a kind of moral security and peace. Moreover, this service life will not be easy. Like everywhere else in the army, there will be discipline, and so on. But I believe the lads will be able to go home on Sundays to help their parents with household jobs.

[Laan] It is clear that there will be enough soldiers, but what about officers?

[Raidal] There is an agreement with officers that in August, 10 men will leave Otepaa for training. This will take place with the help of the republican rescue department, and by September they should have at least finished the first course. [passage omitted] As everywhere else in the world, the army must be prestigious and respectable, not some kind of a beggar, and I firmly believe that what will also help with the officer cadres in Estonia is that at least there should be a settled material stimulus.

Of course, I do not believe that our Republic of Estonia should now follow the path of the kind the USSR did in its time, so that all the profits generated by the national economy are invested in the military industry. There can be no talk of this at all. But of course, some kind of a small percentage of the income that the Estonian people earn today must go this way because our security starts with our defense capability. Everybody has a right to spit in our faces, so we must have a handkerchief with which to wipe off the spit.

Hard Currency Auction Breaks Records

LD1507183891 Tallinn Radio Tallinn Network in Estonian 1200 GMT 10 Jul 91

[Text] Something sensational happened at the hard currency auction which opened at noon today at the Estonian Bank. The ratio of supply and demand brought the exchange rate of the U.S. dollar to 75 rubles [R] to the dollar. This has been reported by the BALTIC NEWS SERVICE. According to the Estonian bank's information sheet $830,525 were due to be sold. The actual quantity sold turned out to be somewhat smaller. According to the requests received before the auction opened the minimum selling price was R32 per dollar, and the maximum purchase price R45 per dollar. In the course of the auction it turned out that the demand from those wanting to buy dollars exceeded the supply by up to 15 times. Altogether about $10 million were purchased. Thanks to this the dollar exchange rate rose to about 75 rubles per dollar.

In the opinion of banking specialists a demand of this kind resulted from the arrival of a considerable number of buyers from the Soviet Union where the only legal opportunity to buy or sell hard currency is at the so-called hard currency exchange market of the USSR State Bank. Trading at this market takes place every Tuesday. On 2 July, however, there was no trading on the pretext that the market was out of balance. On 9 July only $5,440,000 were sold at the rate of R49.6 to the dollar.

The Estonian Bank is practically the only bank within the economic space of the Soviet Union where enterprises, regardless of their place of registration, can freely buy and sell hard currency. This factor has made the Estonian Bank's hard currency auctions fairly well-known and popular with enterprises in the USSR. The hard currency auction is continuing, with other currencies being bought and sold.

Bank Head Warns of Approaching Financial Crisis

OW1507104491 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1915 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Head of the Estonian department of the USSR State Bank Galina Litvinova described as well-justified the statement of the Estonian Deputy Finance Minister Enn Roose about the approaching financial crisis in the republic as Estonia does not receive enough cash from the USSR. Roose disclosed this fact on Wednesday in an interview to Estonian Radio and emphasized that the centre was using this tactic to force Estonia to sign the Union Treaty.

Litvinova confirmed in an interview to BALTFAX that Estonia's stock of cash dropped from a 2- to 3-month level to a 1-month level. However, she disagreed categorically that the financial difficulties had a political underpinning. "Wages and salaries grow, more loans are given, etc." said the USSR State Bank official.

According to her, there was a bank run in Estonia following the interview by Roose.

Estonia is making efforts to introduce a system of cheque books efficient [word as received] only in the republic. They will be used instead of money. The books with 5-ruble, 10-ruble, 25-ruble, 50-ruble and 100-ruble cheques will be printed in several months. However, the proposal to introduce cheque books was opposed by the Bank of Estonia as they will be easy to counterfeit.

Latvia

Party Resolution Hits Democratic Reforms Movement

PM1607091991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Jul 91 First Edition p 1

["Direct Line" report by Correspondent Colonel M. Ziyeminsh: "Stance Taken By Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau"]

[Text] Riga—A sitting of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau adopted a resolution defining its stance on the new "Movement for Democratic Reforms" organized by E. Shevardnadze, A. Yakovlev, G. Popov, A. Sobchak, and others. The document points out that practical actions designed to split the CPSU are being carried out under cover of the new movement's slogans. In these actions one can trace desire by some politicians—former members of the CPSU—to create a broad opposition in the country and, in the future, a political party with a view to fighting for power. All Communists are recommended to refrain from joining the new movement, which has clearly been set up to counterbalance the CPSU.

The need to strengthen the unity of party ranks on the basis of the decisions adopted by the 28th CPSU Congress and the 25th Latvian Communist Party Congress is taking center stage in all organizational and political work and also in the process of the coming discussion of the draft new CPSU program.

Banks Seen as Riga OMON's Next Target

PM1507151991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jul 91 p 1

[S. Drozdov report: "The Only Thing Is They Do Not Need Deposits"]

[Text] In the opinion of USSR People's Deputy Sergey Belozertsev, the next step by the Riga OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] will be an attack on banks. It is assumed, however, that they will not touch ordinary savings banks.

At the end of May, as a member of a deputies' commission, S. Belozertsev conducted an investigation into the events in Riga 22-24 May, when OMON members carried out several attacks on customs posts. The commission reached the conclusion that "the OMON plan of action for eliminating customs posts was agreed with the leadership of the Latvian Prosecutor's Office, while the leadership of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs and the USSR Prosecutor's Office actively coordinated the actions of the Riga and Lithuanian OMON."

The main aim was to "show disrespect for legally elected organs of power" and "to inspire fear in the citizens of Latvia and force them to ask the old Communist leadership for help."

S. Belozertsev evaluates the OMON's actions as overtly provocative, since they "are bound to provoke the use of force in return—which will provide an excuse for the broad mobilization of the army against the people."

Official Interviewed on OMON Activities

OW1607050091 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1500 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A BF [BALTFAX] correspondent reports from Riga that the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Latvian Republic, the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Latvian SSR, and a special team of the Prosecutor General's Office of the USSR are carrying out an intensive investigation of the activities of OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] (the riot police of the USSR Ministry of the Interior).

In an interview to BF, the deputy head of the investigation department of the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Latvian Republic, Lev Voronov, has said that the preliminary results of the investigation testify that there was nothing to provoke OMON's seizure of the Republic's Ministry of the Interior, contrary to the claims of the OMON commanders. This has been testified by the interrogations of witnesses, the results of criminalistic examinations, including those in connection with the deaths and injuries among civilians in the course of the operation.

As regards other similar acts of OMON's in Latvia, Lev Voronov said that "it has been conclusively proved that they were violations of both the Union and Republican legislations".

The investigation is, however, impeded by OMON's refusal to fall in with the demands of the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Latvian Republic. As regards the armed attack on the car of the Leningrad television reporter Aleksandr Nevzorov last February, Voronov said that "the investigation results suggest the attack was feigned".

The head of the investigation department of the Public Prosecutor's Office of the Latvian SSR, Nikolay Aleksandrov, has confirmed the information that his office has instituted criminal proceedings against OMON. But he said it was practically impossible to proceed with the investigation because of the obstacles put up by the authorities.

Commenting on the attack on Aleksander Nevzorov and the OMON unit accompanying him, Aleksandrov said that his office had come to the conclusion that the attack had not been feigned.

He believed it had been a terrorist act carried out by extremists from the Latvian independence movement.

The leader of the special investigation team of the USSR Prosecutor General's Office, Valeriy Kostyrev, has said that the team has not been instructed to investigate any other events apart from those which took place in Riga on January 20, the day when the Republic's Ministry of the Interior was stormed and seized.

Kostyrev said his team had collected a considerable amount of material and begun to identify the weapons and ammunitions it had been able to get hold of.

"The results of the identification will be the basis for prosecution," he said.

Kostyrev believed it was possible that the USSR Prosecutor General's Office might recommend that OMON be abolished if it were proved that it had been involved in unprovoked illegal acts. But the final decision, he emphasised, would have to be taken by the minister of the interior of the USSR.

Our correspondent reports that the investigations into OMON's activities in Lithuania and Estonia are being carried out by nobody out the national public prosecutors' offices of the republics.

In Lithuania, the work is supervised by Jakavicius, the senior inspector on especially important cases under the Public Prosecutor General of the Lithuanian Republic.

Jakavicius has told our correspondent that the Public Prosecutor's Office has legal cases ready against some specific members of the Vilnius OMON branch.

"But it is extremely difficult to actually put these people on trial," said Jakavicius. "They are all well armed and ignore our decisions, saying that this conduct is sanctioned by the Public Prosecutor of the Lithuanian SSR."

The Public Prosecutor's Office of the Lithuanian Republic intends to organise special professional teams out of the personnel of Lithuania's Ministry of the Interior and Home Defense Department to carry out sanctioned arrests of prosecuted OMON members. Apart from this, Jakavicius said, the television and press of Lithuania are soon going to show their photographs. He is convinced that some of OMON's activities are violations even of Soviet laws. Jakavicius also said that a joint Latvian-Lithuanian group was being formed to investigate OMON's attacks on customs posts on the border between the two republics.

In Estonia, the investigation of OMON's attacks on customs posts is headed by Deputy Public Prosecutor of the Republic, Roots, who believes that the material collected in Estonia will be incorporated in the cases made by the Latvian Public Prosecutor's Office. He has expressed the hope that "the problem of OMON terrorism will be solved very shortly".

Lithuania

Landsbergis Asks Gorbachev To Withdraw Militia

LD1607090991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius Network in Lithuanian 1600 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] Today, the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis, sent a telegram to the Soviet Union's president, Mikhail Gorbachev. It says:

Highly esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, circumstances compel me to appeal to you about the issue which has been raised more than once, both by us and the world. This is the activity of the armed Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON] in Lithuania which is maintained and armed by the Soviet Union's Ministry of Internal Affairs. The OMON actions violate all laws and have discredited you and your country more than once.

Presently, the probability is that they will be used as a target for provocations by the State Security Committee, which would provide a pretext for a new attack by the Soviet Union's Armed Forces and their units on the institutions of the Republic of Lithuania. In addition to the unavoidable bloodshed and destabilization, this course of events, I am convinced, is completely unnecessary for the Soviet Union. In view of all this, I insistently ask you, Mr. President, to issue an order to the Vilnius OMON unit of the Soviet Union's Ministry of Internal Affairs to withdraw from the territory of the Republic of Lithuania.

This telegram to the Soviet Union's president, Mikhail Gorbachev, was signed by the chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Lithuania, Vytautas Landsbergis.

More Details of Request Cited

LD1507174991 Moscow TASS in English 1724 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius July 15 TASS—A telegram sent today by President of the Lithuanian Parliament Vytautas Landsbergis to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev requests the Soviet president to give orders to pull out the special task force of the Soviet Interior Ministry from Lithuania.

The request is substantiated by allegedly available information to use the task force as a target for a provocation in order to exploit this provocation as a "pretext for new actions by the Soviet Army in Lithuania".

The Government Press Office circulated a statement several days ago about a "possible destruction of the special task force of the Soviet Interior Ministry, stationed in Vilnius".

The statement even named the executor: "plain-clothed servicemen of the Soviet Armed Forces or servicemen clothed in the uniforms of the Lithuanian Defence Department or Lithuanian police".

The government said that it "resolutely disassociates itself from provocations which are being hatched against the special task force stationed in Vilnius". The statement stressed that "neither the defence department, nor police, nor still other services of the Lithuanian Republic were given orders to destroy the aforementioned force".

The special task force was set up during the tragic events in Vilnius last January when a group of law enforcement officers refused to take orders from the republican Interior Ministry.

Its last action was the capture of the Vilnius telephone exchange several weeks ago. For this action, the task force's commanding officers were summoned to the Soviet Interior Ministry and censured for their actions.

Signatures Being Collected in Support of OMON

OW1607044591 Moscow BALTFAX in English 1830 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] A briefing was held today in Lithuania's Supreme Council, at which it was repored that last Friday a group of people in plain clothes had been collecting signatures in Trakai District, not far from Vilnius, under an appeal stressing the necessity of the further presence of OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] units in the Republic.

Witnesses say that the signature collectors were trying to convince local people that OMON was essential to maintain law and order in the republic, a task to carry out which the Lithuanian police and the Home Defence Department were "obviously insufficient". They also promised assistance in the establishment of Polish autonomy in Lithuania.

The collection of signatures, which was organised by the Communist Party of Lithuania, was started during the demonstration on May 9 in Vilnius.

At the same briefing, the press secretary of the Lithuanian Parliament, Audrius Azubalis, said that the Home Defence Department possesses evidence to the effect that some of the weapons which were used by soldiers from the Pskov Division during the January events are presently being smuggled into Lithuania in order to be illegally sold there. "The purpose of this," said Azubalis, "is to prove that the shooting on January 13 was not done by the army but by Sajudis members."

At the same time, Colonel Edmundas Kasperavicius of the KGB claimed in a television address he made last Friday from the television centre occupied by the Soviet Army since January 13 that "every day columns of lorries bring weapons to the Parliament building". He said he believed the weapons might be used against "dissidents".

Workers Hold 'Protest Shift' 15 Jul

OW1607054791 Moscow BALTFAX in English 0930 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] On July 15, 10 staffers of the Vilnius TV and-Radio Centre and the Press Building are holding a political "protest shift".

The decision on conducting the action was taken in Vilnius on July 13 at a protest rally held half a year after the tragic developments in the Lithuanian capital last January that claimed 14 lives.

At 11:00 Lithuanians are holding an action by the USSR Defense Ministry in Moscow and will then proceed to the USSR KGB. The demonstrators will disseminate an appeal passed at the protest rally in Vilnius.

It says, specifically, that the Lithuanian Republic's government has repeatedly requested the Soviet president, the Supreme Soviet and other top Soviet authorities for help in persuading the USSR Defense Ministry's units from leaving the structures they are occupying in the Lithuanian capital. However, their requests were not heeded, emphasized the appeal.

"We appeal to you, people of goodwill in Moscow and Russia: Help us retrieve our buildings occupied by the Soviet troops and return to our workplaces," says the document.

16 Jul Congress of People's Deputies Proceedings

Supreme Soviet Candidates Stalemate Again

LD1607082591 Moscow TASS in English 0811 GMT 16 Jul 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Yuriy Kozmin and Andrey Urzhansky]

[Text] Moscow July 16 TASS—The Russian Federation's fifth Congress of People's Deputies has failed to elect a new parliamentary chairman as none of the two contenders gained the required majority, or 531 votes.

In today's voting, ballot papers had the names of Ruslan Khasbulatov and Sergey Baburin who won respectively 414 and 458 votes.

In all rounds of voting Baburin won more votes even though Khasbulatov's chances were considered better. The latter failed to win the post because some democrats do not vote for this candidacy.

The congress is now to decide whether to continue the session and put forward new candidacies to the post of parliamentary chairman or delay the issue until autumn.

Conciliation Body Formed

LD1607094891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0920 GMT 16 Jul 91

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 16 Jul (TASS)—The fifth Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Repubic [RSFSR] Congress of People's Deputies, now in its sixth day in the Kremlin, is unable to extricate itself from the dead end created as a result of the inconclusive elections for the post of chairman of the Russian parliament.

After another unsuccessful attempt to elect a chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia at today's morning session of the congress, the deputies decided to create a conciliation commission, made up of representatives of the various parties and factions in order to attempt to find a way out of the stalemate.

A proposal to break off the congress until autumn, which was again submitted to a vote today, did not receive the necessary number of votes required by the rules. [passage omitted]

The situation at the congress, attended today for the first time by RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin, has become more tense. A two-hour break has been declared, during which the conciliation commission will hold its first sitting.

15 Jul Congress of People's Deputies Proceedings

LD1507213191

[Editorial Report] Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian at 1846 GMT on 15 July begins to carry 90 minutes of recorded highlights of the Fifth RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Congress of People's Deputies proceedings in the Kremlin on 15 July.

Svetlana Goryacheva is shown chairing the session. The board shows 877 present. Goryacheva invites Rassokhin, chairman of the Secretariat, to the rostrum. Rassokhin complains about a "Vesti" news item shown yesterday which insulted deputies and about deputies not attending the session. He names a deputy absent because of sickness.

At 1850 GMT Goryacheva announces that the main business is candidates for chairman of the Supreme Soviet. She invites Rybkin to the rostrum to explain efforts to sort out the election problems. There were five candidates. Rybkin explains the suggestions of the various factions.

At 1855 GMT the continuity announcer says there was a stormy debate about voting procedures.

At 1856 GMT Goryacheva suggests putting up the two candidacies, Baburin and Khasbulatov, then allowing speakers to nominate others or themselves. At the rostrum Deputy Afanasyev complains about the behavior of the Russian Communists and recalls problems caused at previous congresses. There is a lot of noise in the hall throughout his speech. He ignores Goryacheva's calls to get to the point. Finally he calls for Baburin's supporters to withdraw his candidacy, the microphone is cut off and Goryacheva asks deputies to respect the standing orders.

At 1901 GMT the announcer says Yuriy Yarov, chairman of the Leningrad regional council, and Ispravnikov were nominated; Ispravnikov withdraws.

At 1902 GMT Sergey Baburin is shown speaking at the rostrum. He counters Afanasyev's claim that he represents the CPSU and says he accepts the responsibility that his nomination represents. On restructuring the national state structure, Baburin says it would be a mistake to erase all the present boundaries at a strike. The Bolsheviks made that mistake, now the neo-Bolsheviks want to make it again. Baburin says he voted for Yeltsin without hesitation at the first congress. He did not vote at all in the presidential election. Their views have not diverged entirely, however. They both want the best for Russia.

At 1907 GMT Baburin replies to questions from the floor. He says he feels that Russia should be run by a coalition of forces. He would ask Khasbulatov to work with the leadership. He would hope to see a representative of centrist deputies of those not belonging to groups, such as Yarov in the post of deputy chairman.

At 1910 GMT a deputy asks about telegrams arriving at the Secretariat. He says only one supporting Baburin has arrived, compared with many for Khasbulatov. Baburin says it all depends on how much you will pay to have a telegram sent.

At 1912 GMT Baburin is asked if he would support the democratic procedures of the Supreme Soviet and economic reforms. A deputy questions his ability to work with a coalition and Baburin says he will do all he can to help the progress of reforms. As for cooperation, it is only by discussing things and coming to an agreed approach that anything will succeed, he says. Yeltsin and he have more in common than they have differences, Baburin points out.

At 1916 GMT a deputy asks if Baburin's opinions about free economic zones have changed, and how Baburin would feel if Khasbulatov were chairman and he were deputy. Baburin says the free economic zones need to be properly defined before such a status is granted. Like any deputy, says Baburin, he would carry out any duties the congress charged him with.

At 1919 GMT a deputy asks if Baburin realizes his election would cause a crisis because he would be continually clashing with the president. Wouldn't his association with the "six" mean not a grand coalition, but a Big Brother situation? Baburin replies that we have to learn to live not according to the old ways of one-dimensional thinking.

At 1921 GMT Khasbulatov is invited to the rostrum. You must be bored with seeing the same faces over and again, he says. Khasbulatov says he is a little vulnerable if people look at the failures of the past Supreme Soviet, but on the other hand there are plenty of successes to be pround of, as well. Khasbulatov agrees with Baburin that Yarov would be a good candidate for deputy chairman, and so would Sobchak. He discusses their virtues as well as those of other potential deputy chairmen.

Khasbulatov begins taking questions from the floor. A deputy asks about cooperation with Yarov. Khasbulatov says the way they scrabble for posts is undignified. Whoever is elected to lead should be given the chance to choose his team and lead effectively.

At 1928 GMT a deputy asks whether Khasbulatov will uphold the democratic principles of the house. Khasbulatov says he is a straight forward person, but he understands the need for compromise. He recalls that a large group of deputies approached him some time ago to stand for chairman.

At 1930 GMT a deputy in uniform reads out statistics on the voting for chairman which show greater support for Baburin and he asks how Khasbulatov would feel about being his deputy. Khasbulatov says he expected greater support. Popular approval of the Supreme Soviet's work has been rising, not falling. Possibilities for the candidacies were discussed earlier with the various factions, he says.

At 1933 GMT a deputy asks if he objects to some deputies' behavior, which detracts from his authority, apparently referring to a TV show on Friday. Khasbulatov says the dignity of the Supreme Soviet and of the congress should be defended. He is not offended at insults about him personally.

At 1935 GMT a deputy asks if he can see himself as anything but chairman. Khasbulatov says he sees himself also as a professor.

At 1936 GMT a deputy from an autonomous region says she has been surprised by his latest answers on autonomies, given his earlier support for their cause. Is he playing games? Why did he mention no young people among his list of potential deputies? Khasbulatov says he is not playing any games; If he were, he could have won in the first round.

At 1939 GMT a deputy asks whether the congress has reached a deadlock. Perhaps it should adjourn until the autumn? Khasbulatov says there is some logic to this, but on the other hand, a constitutional court must be elected, and the structures for presidential power must be created. We live in times of crisis, and the Supreme Soviet must have a properly elected chairman now, although he would continue to fill in as first deputy chairman if necessary.

At 1941 GMT Goryacheva invites Yarov to the rostrum. Yarov says efforts are needed to unite the deputies. He outlines the program of the group of deputies supporting him. Economic reforms must be promoted, the economic crisis is deepening, and the Supreme Soviet must act to rescue Russia. There can be no left-right division here. There has to be strict budgetary control. Finance and materials must be made available for agriculture. Enterprise in the countryside must be encouraged. Everyone must support the rural areas. Health care must be attended to; the birth rate is falling behind the death rate. The environment is an important issue. Education, science, and culture should be supported. The Supreme Soviet must work out a clear division of responsibilities between the various structures so that we can all get on with our work unhindered. Arrangements must be made to ensure that Supreme Soviet deputies get full and timely information and are able to attend and participate in legislative activity. The most important task facing Russian deputies is to adopt a new constitution, he concludes.

At 1951 GMT Yarov answers deputies questions. How does he see the future structure of the RSFSR? How does he feel about a book by Granin which lauds a scientist who helped the Germans in wartime? Yarov says he wants to see a unified Russia. As for Granin's book *Zubr*, Yarov says one would have to understand the position of the scientist, though one may disapprove of it.

At 1954 GMT a deputy from "St Petersburg" asks about land reform, claiming that Yarov has done little to promote it in Leningrad Oblast. Yarov replies by quoting some figures and says that state farm land is among that allocated for the development of private farms. Yarov says that blanket decollectivization would be just as big a mistake as the blanket collectivization of the 1930's. Yarov says he is dedicated to the land reform endorsed by the congress.

At 1958 GMT a deputy asks what steps are needed urgently to help farmers. Yarov suggests that every possible aid should be given as soon as possible.

Yarov answers questions from the floor. He says he will strengthen the legislative basis of the Supreme Soviet. He also says that he would respect the will of Leningraders regarding renaming the town but this should be done in a civilized manner.

At 2024 GMT a deputy from the radical democrats asks for the floor. He says that Democratic Russia is showing Bolshevist tendencies and levels a stream of accusations at other democratic sections. He proposes to set up a faction of pure democrats and to split from Democratic Russia.

At 2027 GMT a deputy from Democratic Russia takes the floor for a statement. He says that the process of merger between the extreme right and extreme left is obvious and the result is an election stalemate. Democrats should stop their squabbles and vote for Khasbulatov.

At 2030 GMT the announcer says another round of elections was held in the evening. The chairman of the tellers commission takes the floor to announce the results. Baburin—448 for and 512 against; Khasbulatov—404 for and 556 against; Yarov—74 for and 886 against.

At 2032 GMT Goryacheva announces that another round will be held, with Baburin and Khasbulatov as the two contenders. Tomorrow's sitting will open at 0600 GMT.

Third Candidate in Congress Vote Noted

LD1507152791 Moscow all-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Excerpts] [Announcer] At the Congress of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] People's Deputies. On the line is our parliamentary correspondent Gennadiy Kalenov.

[Kalenov] [passage omitted] The congress started in a rather emotional way. As a result of nomination, candidates are the same—first of all, Khasbulatov and Baburin: Both these candidates are intending to fight to the end. And one more candidate was added to them—Yuriy Fedorovich Yarov from Leningrad, chairman of the oblast soviet. All the candidates spoke, presenting their programs, and answering questions. Thus, Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov, answering the question on the way the situation has developed, and appraising it, said that he had expected to be a more popular figure at the congress. However, obviously, something—he does not know exactly what—occurred on the left wing of the democratic movement, and a certain gap appeared there. On the eve of the congress, the Supreme Soviet of Russia and its leadership had intentions, and made steps, toward cooperation with all political parties and groupings, but, alas, unity did not work.

At the moment, without discussing the first two candidates, since they have been discussed before in the previous rounds, while the candidacy of Yarov was supported by a group of deputies, all three names were entered on the secret ballot sheets and adopted by the congress.

Now we are having a one hour break at the Congress. The voting is going to take place at 1800 [1500 GMT] and at 1900 the results of the voting must be announced.

Attempt Under Way To End Impasse

LD1507122591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrovna]

[Excerpts] Moscow, 15 Jul (TASS)—The Fifth Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], which opened 10 July, resumed work in the Kremlin today. [passage omitted]

A deadlock has emerged in which neither of the two political blocs into which the Congress has split is able to get its candidates through. Therefore, it has been decided that the Congress' work today will begin with a meeting of the factions to try to find a way out of the impasse. The plenary session will continue after dinner.

Agriculture Minister Addresses Congress 12 Jul

LD1207234591 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1927 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Comments by Gennadiy Vasilyevich Kulik, minister of agriculture of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) and first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, at the Fifth RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin on 12 July chaired by Svetlana P. Goryacheva; from the "On the Work of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies" program—recorded]

[Text] [Goryacheva] Esteemed People's Deputies: Before moving on to the next matter and hearing a report from Gennadiy Vasilyevich Kulik, first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, I want to remind you that People's Deputy Medvedev made a proposal while addressing the congress that this matter should be examined in a closed session. I am now putting this matter to the vote. Who is in favor of examining Gennadiy Vasilyevich's report and questioning him in closed session? I ask you to vote now. [video shows result of vote as 399 for, 394 against, with 28 abstentions] The decision is not passed. I invite you to the rostrum, Gennadiy Vasilyevich. How much time do you need?

[Kulik] Up to 10 minutes.

[Goryacheva] Up to 10 minutes. Good.

[Kulik] Esteemed People's Deputies: Permit me, in response to the question that has been tabled, to give you a short account of the situation concerning breadgrain [khleb] in our republic. First and foremost, I want to tell you that as a result of the measures taken by the republic's government, its leadership, we have been able, by and large, to meet the grain needs of the republic's economy in the first half of this year.

Over the first half of this year breadgrain consumption for food and other industrial needs rose in comparison with the equivalent period last year by 600,000 tonnes, which is more than 8 percent. I want to say that the rise in retail prices of bread led in practical terms to a slight reduction in breadgrain usage in May only, while this month breadgrain usage is at the same level as in March and April. To provide for the breadgrain needs of the republic's population and for other needs of ours, the government has had to take very vigorous steps in other republics and abroad to obtain decentralized purchases. The fact is that, under the agreement signed between the Union Government and the Union republics, we were due to receive 15 million tonnes of grain in the first half year. We actually received 9.8 million tonnes. When one considers that our monthly usage norm is around 5 million tonnes, then in practical terms the republic was left without breadgrain resources at all. For this reason, faced with such a situation, the initiative was taken by the government and leadership of the republic, as it were, to buy some breadgrain resources. We managed to do this. Even so, the situation at the end of June and beginning of July was fairly difficult. Today it can be said that for July and the succeeding months we will be in a position to meet the republic's retail needs for grain and other needs.

So much for the past. What is the situation now?

I must report that this year has confirmed, once again, the wisdom of the popular proverb: What is in the field is not bread. Bread is what is in the granary.

Prospects for the harvest were good in our largest zone of marketable grain production—the Volga region, and in the Northern Caucasus. Mind you, winter fields were preserved very well in these regions, and it is they that are the most productive. However, the 35-day-long drought, when the temperature rose to over 40 degrees centigrade, have caused, according to scientific estimation, a loss of biological harvest of up to 40 to 45 centners [per hectare]. Today the threshing is already going on. I can say that, for example, Krasnodar Kray has completed the harvesting of barley. Its yield today amounts to 41 centners. According to old standards, say of two or three years ago, this yield is not particularly bad. However, last year the kray gathered 52 centners per hectare of this crop. We can say today that the harvest is appoximately five or six centners lower than last year in Stavropol Kray, Rostov Oblast, and in the rayons of the central black earth region. Thus, this territory will not get a harvest at the level of last year. As for Siberia, the situation is even more complex there. A prolonged spring drought struck some rayons of Bashkiriya and of Chelyabinsk, Kurgan, Novosibirsk, and Omsk Oblasts, as well as most of the regions in Altay Kray. Although there was rain there recently, and this will reflect well on late crops, particularly potatoes, industrial crops, and fodder crops, I can report to the congress today that we will not receive the planned harvest in this zone. This region accounts for 12.5 million tonnes of marketable grain, or is one-fourth of marketable grain resources of our republic.

What conclusions can we make, can the government make, and what follows from this report? To my mind, the conclusion consists of one thing only: to conduct the harvesting as energetically as possible, by no means to allow the losses that occured during last year's harvest, and to preserve all of the harvest we get and to make efficient use of what has been gathered.

This is the direction in which the Council of Ministers and the leadership of the republic are working. The resolution on supplementary measures to form the feedstuff resources and other food resources of the republic in 1991 has been distributed to you. What has the government done in order to counter all these misfortunes with the maximum of good organization and, as it were, dynamism in bringing in the harvest? We have today mobilized for the bringing in of the harvest 42,000 trucks. Of these, 19,000 are already at work in the grain regions. Another 30,000 are being supplied to us by the army. We have made the decision, despite declining oil production, the output of fuel and lubricants, to ensure the deliveries to the countryside of diesel fuel and gasoline, to the detriment of other consumers. I want to say that yesterday, since the beginning of the year, against the norms that we have, the deliveries totalled 93.8 percent. True, a number of rayons are as yet experiencing serious problems with fuel. This applies, as far as the south is concerned, above all to many rayons of Rostov; the other regions are Altay Kray and a number of others. This is due today to the delivery of fuel. I want to believe, or rather to assure you, esteeemd people's deputies, that the government is keeping an eye on this situation. We are taking measures to transfer fuel, with a view to preventing delays in bringing in the harvest.

Now, as to the resolution itself. Many deputies have already received it. Today we held a meeting with officials of the procurement bodies and agricultural bodies and the commercial exchanges that have been engaged in grain procurement. We examined the situation in detail. What I would like to draw attention to is that this resolution, which has been passed today by the leadership of Russia, can be arbitrarily divided into three parts. The first: It is once again emphasized that in the present difficult situation any infringement of the laws that have been passed is impermissible. We know that we have passed a law on the food tax, so this resolution stresses that implementation of the food tax regarding the sale of grain, technical, and other crops is today incumbent on every rural producer, irrespective of the forms of ownership. This resolution stresses that the government alone may review and change the food tax indicator.

Second, we realize that we will not be able to attract a large enough quantity of commodity resources of grain. That is why a whole complex of measures have been proposed to give the producer greater interest in selling grain to the state. I would like to single out the first of these measures. Obviously, contractual prices are being introduced on the sale of grain by collective and state farms and other producers over and above the food tax. That will make it possible to begin to form a Russian grain market. This is extremely important in this specific situation and in the future, too.

Further, we realize that today you cannot simply interest the producers by money, by monetary resources alone. Incidentally, many contenders for the post of chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Russia spoke correctly on that theme from this rostrum yesterday. Therefore, I will say this to you: The government has diverted everything that is possible from material resources for counter selling to the village. We want to sell to rural dwellers for grain as a counter sale 120,000 passenger motor vehicles, 200,000 refrigerators and televisions, and 150,000 washing machines. A resolution was adopted today that 15 percent of the material and technical resources that all enterprises receive on the territory of Russia are to be diverted for counter sale to collective and state farms.

I would also like to draw your attention to the following: We are forced to defend the Russian market, to defend the interests of Russia. That is why such a resolution is being introduced and has been adopted—to introduce in 1991 the licensing of the export of grain beyond the borders of the republic.

Realizing that we need to gather the harvest quickly, we recommend a very broad use of measures to naturally stimulate workers employed in gathering the harvest. All restrictions are lifted on giving natural payment to those who work in gathering, transporting, storing, and processing the harvest.

It seems to us that the implementation of this series of measures.... [changes thought] We are counting here on the very active support of the local bodies, of soviets, of agricultural bodies, and agricultural workers. I think that the implementation of that resolution may stimulate considerably the increase in the sale of grain to the state's resources, speed up the bringing in of the harvest, reduce the losses, and guarantee that it is kept safe.

I would like to end my information in the briefest way. I want to say the following in conclusion: We have instructions from the president and the government to prepare. When we are able to determine more clearly the gross grain yield, we can prepare concrete proposals with a view to guaranteeing the food resources of the population of the republic in the second half of this year and in 1992. I think that these proposals will be examined by the Supreme Soviet and other bodies since the significance is extremely great.

Thank you for your attention.

Answers Deputies Questions

LD1307192191 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 1840 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Question and answer session with Gennadiy Vasilyevich Kulik, minister of agriculture of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, and first deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and Russian people's deputies at the Fifth RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session at the Kremlin in Moscow on 12 July; from the "On the Work of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies" program—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Karpov] Deputy Karpov, Constituency No. 589. I have the following questions. What percentage of "Harvest-90" certificates have been paid up, and when will they be fully paid up? That is the first question. My second question: How much more grain will we be forced to import from abroad in the coming season than we did last season? And then two questions which might be described as of a strategic nature: Is there in fact a hope that we might sometime stop importing grain, and in how many years can we hope for that to happen? And what kind of amount, in billions of dollars, will Russia spend by the year 2000 on importing grain?

[Kulik] Thank you. First, on the question of the "Harvest-90" certificates. So far various organizations which are operating the "Harvest-90" government program have signed contracts for the supply of consumer goods to the value of $560 million. At the rate of exchange applying to trade today that is approximately $7 billion [as heard]. In order to fully pay them off I have said that we have also sold 10,000 cars against "Harvest-90" certificates, as well as furniture and certain other kinds of goods. We have approximately 100-150 billion left to be covered by contracts, and then we shall have completely paid up on the "Harvest-90" program.

As for grain purchases, I would like to answer that question, esteemed people's deputies, in the following way. I have said that we were due to receive 15 million tonnes this year. Given that as yet there is not a confirmed final balance it would be premature to talk about how much grain we shall need to buy in the current year. But I shall say that these purchases will not be lower than they were last year. As for a forecast up to the year 2000, it would be quite immodest of me to give an answer here and now to a question which requires very deep analysis, a carefully weighed approach and in-depth calculations. But as the question has been asked let me just add the following. We believe that we need to make sharp changes to the structure of our grain imports, given that we procure enough food grain to meet the needs of the population of Russia. What we do not have enough of is feed grain. So what we have in mind is to increase sharply the purchase of oil-seed meal, protein-rich fodder, and maize. [passage omitted]

[Ivanchenko] Deputy Ivanchenko, Territorial Constituency No. 66. Gennadiy Vasilyevich, you have set out a whole package of measures to enhance economic incentives for peasants to produce grain and sell it to the state. This is undoubtedly a positive development since it will make it possible to improve the economics of agriculture. But I would like to hear your view, your forecast, of how this will develop further. Because it all comes down to the cost of fodder and the area of livestock raising, and will all be reflected in the effects of changes in retail prices on food products. So what more is to be expected in this area?

[Kulik] Thank you. That is also a very interesting question, and it is one which has been discussed a great deal. You have remarked—and incidentally the government was trying to urge us to this, but we have resisted raising grain prices, though there was very powerful pressure simply to raise them. But I realize that that would be followed by what you have described. And for that reason we have chosen a different course—that of contract prices. As for how the budget will work out for procurement organizations now, well, we have a whole number of ideas of our own, but all of them are directed precisely at not raising the costs and therefore the price of grain and of livestock products, at preserving that very fragile parity which we have now in society. And that is the reason we opted for the path as proposed in this resolution, or rather as enshrined in this resolution.

[Solovyev] Deputy Solovyev from Udmurt SSR, Constituency No. 879. I have a question not directly on this subject but it is one which I submitted at the first meeting of the congress and I wonder why it was not addressed in Gennadiy Vasilyevich's report. Esteemed Gennadiy Vasilyevich, the state of affairs concerning sugar in the Russian Federation is worse than that concerning grain. [passage omitted] How are we to get by, and is the government of the Russian Federation intending to resolve this matter? The food industry is at a standstill. This is an urgent matter and I think we should today hear some practical details for resolving it.

[Kulik] Thank you. Esteemed comrade deputies, you have raised many pressing questions about food, but I agree with what you have said today, namely that the most pressing today is that of sugar. The situation is as follows. Russia... we ourselves are meeting our requirement for sugar to the extent of 43 percent. Our industry has fulfilled its sugar output plan. Under the Union-wide agreement, which I mentioned when I was speaking about the grain situation, we were due to receive 3.4 million tonnes of sugar in the form of imports from the Ukraine. Of that, 1.8 million tonnes was to be delivered in the first half of this year. What we have received fell 900,000 tonnes short. Our monthly requirement is 500,000 tonnes, which in simple terms means that over a period of two months Russia had a negative balance of sugar resources. We had foreseen this, and the government repeatedly raised this matter of sugar deliveries to Russia in accordance with the agreement. So what have we done, esteemed people's deputies? Well, we have had to take the most extreme measures, resorting to all our barter capacities, and brought in 100,000 tonnes of sugar from Yugoslavia, which has now begun to arrive. We also brought in 100,000 tonnes of sugar from Europe. And yesterday it was reported to us by Comrade Silayev that the president has authorized us to make use of all our possibilities for obtaining further quantities of sugar during the coming period. Yesterday we held talks and signed a contract for the delivery of a further 300,000 tonnes. And so in July, August, and the first part of September we should be taking delivery of 450,000 or 500,000 tonnes of sugar, and available supplies will be—everyone should be aware of this—not more than 60 percent of last year's level. As for the measures the government has had to take and the bitter situation we find ourselves in, well, I have given you the reasons.

'Unauthorized' Guard Established at Leningrad TV

LD1507153991 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] [Announcer] Additional armed guards have been sent to the Leningrad television committee building. Our correspondent Denis Gurinskiy is live on the line with details:

[Gurinskiy] The Leningrad Association of Servicemen-Internationalists has promptly reacted to the personnel shakeout in the editorial office of the television program 600 Seconds, related to the resignation of some of the editorial staff in this office. Among the activists of this association, those who support the ideas of Aleksandr Nevzorov, artistic director of the 600 Seconds program, have expressed a desire to become voluntary guards of the 600 Seconds program staff. This desire has been granted, as it received Nevzorov's very prompt blessing. A round-the-clock, generously and diversely armed squad has been set in place at the television committee of 600 Seconds.

These voluntary guards weigh up and ensure the operation of a special pass system in the quarters of the editorial office. They man the office phones and accompany film crews of the program collective on their trips around the city and outside it, and also protect the flats of the key staff of the program 600 Seconds. These guards have no legal license but in practical terms have everything essential, and many of the elements in their equipment clearly amaze many of the Leningrad television official guards and inspire latent envy in them.

The organizers of the informal squad claim that its functioning will lead to a notable strengthening in the legal discipline not only in the television committee but also in many of St. Petersburg's important offices. The new squad of the 600 Seconds collective are in addition convinced of their sufficient mental and physical effectiveness to assist the Nevzorov television crew in getting access to any offices in St. Petersburg. The activities of the neophytic squad are not however to the liking of [word indistinct] the leadership of the Leningrad Soviet or the chiefs of the television committee. The squad is absolutely autonomous and not accountable to Boris Petrov, the chief of the Petersburg television. By all accounts that is the circumstance which has stirred Leonid Kravchenko, the president of USSR Television, to make an emergency call to Aleksandr Nevzorov and demand an explanation for the unauthorized squad.

Nevzorov justifies it on the grounds that his editorial office has come under threat, I quote: from actions of the jealous, the mean, and other riff-raff who are ready to exploit the complex personnel situation in the editorial office to overthrow us and to close down the program. As our correspondent has found out from well-informed sources at the television committee, the head of the St. Petersburg television is soon to issue an order abolishing unauthorized squads. In the opinion of some of the television staff, the fulfilment of the order and the disbanding of this squad may entail combat action in the television committee building and around it. Denis Gurinskiy for Russia's radio from the city on the river Neva.

Russians Polled on Attitudes to Parliament

PM1607092591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 13 Jul 91 First Edition p 3

[ROSTASS report under the "Sociologists Attest" rubric: "Russians on Supreme Power"]

[Text] Sociological studies have shown that Russian public opinion is "at a crossroads." As yet extreme viewpoints do not prevail. On the one hand, just 11 percent of the population see the Russian parliament as a "real democratic organ of people's power, doing everything it can to revive Russia." On the other, almost the same proportion cleave to a diametrically opposed opinion. Citing, inter alia, events like the "case of the 140 billion," this set of respondents demand new elections for the Supreme Soviet, which has "compromised its position."

The results of a sociological study of Russians' attitude to RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] organs of supreme power were circulated 12 July at the congress by the Russian Independent Center for Political Research. The analysis was carried out within the framework of a study of popular feelings. Sociologists' initial conclusions are based on the figures produced by a poll of roughly 1,000 respondents in Perm and Murmansk Oblasts and Chuvashia (the poll was carried out via the mass media).

Many responses contain different criticisms, scientists note. People are concerned at instances of faltering work by parliament, the poor organization, and time wasted on trifles.

The center's personnel also remarked on the increase in the people's irritation. It has not reached a high point, but its scale prompts caution. "Supreme Soviet and congress sittings are too often reminiscent of a 'vanity fair' since many deputies use the rostrum for self-advertisement and to settle scores...." That is how almost 35 percent of the poll's respondents assessed the state of affairs. The evolution of these sentiments could perhaps carry them into the camp of those who are already insisting that "it's all the same whoever comes to power, ordinary people's lives will be no easier."

Communists for Democracy Plan New Party

LD1507163691 Moscow TASS in English 1504 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By TASS Parliamentary Correspondent Lyudmila Aleksandrova]

[Text] Moscow July 15 TASS—Leaders of the Communists for Democracy group in the Soviet Communist Party, led by Russian Vice-President Aleksandr Rutskoy, called for the establishment of a new party—a Democratic Party of Russian Communists.

The new party will disassociate itself from the Communist Party of the Russian Federation.

A policy-making statement, circulated today among participants in the fifth special Russian Congress of People's Deputies, says that "perestroyka has run into difficulties, since its real content came into conflict with group interests of the party apparatus which has not understood the essence of the historic moment and the situation under which power is moving to other structures elected by people".

"Struggling to preserve its power, the party apparatus selected the method of vulgarisation of perestroyka ideas and of opposition to the new policy of state authority," the statement says.

The document's authors believe that "the apparatus has turned the communist movement into a movement for its own benefit". In their opinion, the leadership of the Russian Communist Party is also defending "its own benefit".

"We regard today's leadership of the Russian Communist Party as undemocratic and, therefore, short-sighted," the statement says, calling for "passing a no-confidence vote on the policy and leadership of the Russian Communist Party led by Ivan Polozkov".

The statement also calls for "uniting democratic trends in the Communist Party into an organised force" and "organising a new Democratic Party of Russian Communists".

TASS learned at the organising committee of the Communists for Democracy Group that the new party will join the recently established Movement for Democratic Reforms, which was co-founded by Rutskoy.

The founding conference of the Democratic Party of Russian Communists will be held in the near future.

The Republican Party of the Russian Federation (former Democratic Platform in the CPSU) also announced its intention to join the Movement for Democratic Reforms.

Replying to reporters' questions during an interval in the work of the Russian Parliament on Friday, leader of the Russian Communist Party Ivan Polozkov called a party to be established by Rutskoy a "political gamble" and "political fiction".

New Tatar President Shaymiyev Interviewed

PM1607080191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
4 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2

["Topical Interview" with M.Sh. Shaymiyev, newly elected president of Tatarstan, by PRAVDA correspondent N. Morozov in Kazan; date not given: "Sovereignty—Not For Division"]

[Text] As already reported, presidential elections have been held in Tatarstan. The new president is 54-year-old Mintimer Sharipovich Shaymiyev, who since last year has held the post of chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet. More than 70 percent of the voters who took part in the elections voted for him. Another four candidates tried for the presidency, but they failed to gain the requisite number of voters' signatures. We talked to the first president in Tatarstan's history.

[Morozov] Congratulations on your victory, Mintimer Sharipovich. People say you won easily, on the whole, and put it down to your powerful election campaign team....

[Shaymiyev] Well, no: If you yourself do not inspire confidence in people, you will not get anywhere. I reached the stage of single-candidate elections after fighting some tough competition for the mandate of USSR people's deputy and Tatar SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] people's deputy and the post of chairman of the Tatar Supreme Soviet. I have been all over my native land and sweated it out with voters at every meeting. But never mind—I won. Not without reason, one of your colleagues has begun alluding to the translation of my name: In Russian Mintimer means "I am a man of iron." Seriously though, during the election campaign I was made strongly aware of how much people need frankness.

[Morozov] What was the most awkward question asked by voters?

[Shaymiyev] This one, for example: Who needed a presidency— Shaymiyev or Tatarstan? I had to explain that if it only concerned me, I could have become president without any elections. A large group of deputies urgently proposed that a president be elected at the Supreme Soviet session. I was categorically opposed to this and insisted on a nationwide vote. Having embarked on a path of genuine—as opposed to nominal—sovereignty, Tatarstan needs presidential rule. Why? Because we are essentially living through a period of anarchy: The party has stepped back from the government of society but the soviets have yet to achieve sovereignty—indeed, many of them spend more time debating issues than taking action. In this situation, our parliamentarians concluded that the republic needs a strong executive power greatly trusted by the people. As you well know, the people of Tatarstan were in favor of this idea.

[Morozov] It would be very relevant at this point to touch on the Russian presidential elections, which have been the focus of some strong feeling in Tatarstan. The PRAVDA correspondents' office in Kazan has received letters from people who see the Tatar Supreme Soviet's stand regarding the Russian parliament's decision as inconsistent: Tatarstan did not hold a referendum on the question of presidential rule in Russia and went ahead with its own elections regardless.

[Shaymiyev] I categorically reject such opinions. Our republic's Supreme Soviet is not constantly chopping and changing: It adheres to the same course—the course set by the Tatar SSR Declaration of State Sovereignty unanimously adopted on 30 August last year. Under this document, RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and USSR laws which do not conflict with our declaration remain valid in Tatarstan until we adopt a new Tatar Constitution. As we have yet to tackle the question of citizenship, we intended to hold the Russian referendum. But the RSFSR Supreme Soviet permitted gross violations of its own laws during preparations for the referendum, so our Supreme Soviet Presidium felt it was impossible to go ahead with something that had not been prepared properly.

As far as the Russian presidential elections are concerned, we decided to help citizens exercise their electoral rights, however much parties and movements with nationalist ambitions tried to prevent this: Shutting down valves on the main part of the "Druzhba" Oil Pipeline in Almetyevsk, announcing hunger strikes, and putting pressure on deputies. We never tire of reminding those swept along by nationalism or chauvinism that sovereignty must not be given national overtones. We have adopted sovereignty for the whole of the republic's multiethnic population and not just for the indigenous population. I think this stand by parliament is the basis of political stability in Tatarstan.

[Morozov] Many representatives of the Russian-speaking population believe that the Declaration of State Sovereignty is oriented toward Tatarstan seceding from Russia....

[Shaymiyev] Putting the issue this way—should Tatarstan be part of Russia or not?—is altogether inappropriate. It is a question of enhanced state status for the Tatar SSR, economic independence, and, ultimately, the restoration of social justice.

Take the economic, material aspect, for example. In terms of its industrial potential, our republic is on a par with the three Baltic republics put together. But see whose jurisdiction our enterprises come under: 80 percent are the property of USSR ministries, 18 percent are owned by Russian ministries, and the remaining handful belongs to Tatarstan. For the first time in our, the center has done us a favor: It has allowed us to sell 1 million tonnes of our oil abroad. The same can be said of many other kinds of raw materials and goods. But is that really independence? Our republic's current potential—if used carefully—coupled with economic independence will allow us to noticeably improve people's well-being and increase our contribution to the all-Union revenue in a short space of time. That is why our delegation at the May meeting between the USSR president, the head of the Russian parliament, and the chairmen of the autonomous republics' Supreme Soviets expressed our republic's own approach to signing the Union treaty in line with our Declaration of State Sovereignty: Tatarstan intends to sign it only as a member of the USSR. It will subsequently conclude a treaty with the RSFSR.

[Morozov] However, various leaders of republics which belong to the preparatory committee, who were involved in discussing the draft Union treaty in Novo-Ogarevo, have not always reacted approvingly to this statement of yours.

[Shaymiyev] I am aware of how they feel. At the last, concluding meeting in Novo-Ogarevo, I reaffirmed the Tatar delegation's intention to sign the Union treaty independently and directly. My statement did not prompt any particular debate. However, the meeting's participants are obviously concerned about Tatarstan's future relationship with Russia, and also with yesterday's autonomous republics. But, you know, many of the old autonomous formations have essentially made their chosen state status clear, and we have come to an agreement with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin to continue consultations on how we sign the Union treaty.

Furthermore, all the republics understand that our persistence in our approach to the Union treaty is not just stubborness on the part of Shaymiyev as head of the delegation but the considered, collective will of parliament, which has taken the decision to build our relations with Russia on a treaty basis.

[Morozov] Do you feel that the draft Union treaty greatly adds to autonomous formations' sovereignty?

[Shaymiyev] No, in my view, it does not add very much. I think the draft is basically "designed" to suit the interests of the Union republics. We are still left with a pecking order. Autonomous formations can still only dream of full representation in the country's parliament. On the one hand we recognize autonomous formations' sovereignty, and on the other we say in the draft treaty: "Relations between states, one of which is part of the other, are governed by treaties between them and by the Constitution of the state of which it is part...." What kind of renewal is that? Autonomous formations are left to play the role of the smaller matreshka dolls, fitted inside the USSR and the RSFSR. And these are radical changes? Changing the status of just one autonomous formation has been a stumbling block.

[Morozov] Mintimer Sharipovich, what is B.N. Yeltsin's personal attitude to the stand taken by Tatarstan? I still have on tape his famous words spoken before the people in Kazan: "Take as much sovereignty as you can swallow...."

[Shaymiyev] It would hardly be right to reduce the solution to such a complex issue to the personality and will of one individual. But we cannot ignore the personality factor either, of course, especially as we are talking about the Russian president. Boris Nikolayevich respects our position and understands the full complexity of the problem. But just think: If Russia stands up for its economic sovereignty (and things are moving in that direction), all Tatar enterprises currently under USSR and RSFSR jurisdiction will naturally be transferred to Russian jurisdiction, and our republic will be left with nothing. Enterprises under USSR jurisdiction are already kicking up a fuss: They have been deprived of centralized capital investment. Because Russia is not settling accounts with the Union. And what about the Tatar enterprises punctiliously paying money into the Russian budget? I was forced to say in Novo-Ogarevo that, if this economic absurdity continues, Tatarstan will urgently form its own national bank and pay the center its dues—but through its own bank rather than the Russian Bank.

[Morozov] Are you confident of a successful outcome to such a difficult situation?

[Shaymiyev] I am optimistic. I think that after consultation with the Russian leadership we will find a mutually acceptable way of signing the Union treaty and legitimizing relations between our two sovereign states on a fair, treaty basis.

[Morozov] Mintimer Sharipovich, on 4 July the Supreme Soviet will be swearing in the first president of the Republic of Tatarstan. Some believe that this event will push you, a member of the CPSU Central Committee, into suspending your party membership or leaving the party altogether.

[Shaymiyev] I am aware that some people would like that to happen. But I have already made up my mind: Belonging to the CPSU will not prevent me from performing my presidential duties—rather the reverse. If I fight for the CPSU's program objectives, what is bad about that? In terms of democratic thrust, documents like these are thin on the ground, as people say; it is another matter that I am obliged to support and protect the rights of all parties and movements whose activity does not conflict with the law.

[Morozov] And one last question. What is your biggest fear about your forthcoming term as president?

[Shaymiyev] Making mistakes. Everything the president does must make good sense, because the people have invested great trust in him. The time of collective responsibility, which often amounted to collective irresponsibility, is on the way out.

Communists Want Resignation of CPSU Apparatus

PM1507152191 Moscow ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA in Russian 12 Jul 91 p 2

["Politics" report by Correspondent Yuriy Shatalov: "Communist Metallurgists' Ultimatum"]

[Text] Communists at the Solikamsk Magnesium Plant have adopted an unprecedented decision: to suspend their CPSU membership for three months and then disband the party organization if their political demands are not met.

They are demanding the complete resignation of the Politburo, the CPSU Central Committee, and its apparatus; the convening of the 29th party congress this year, and not in the first half of 1992 as promised; and direct contested elections of a new CPSU Central Committee. The metallurgists urged party organizations in the city, the oblast, and the country to back these demands.

What is behind the Solikamsk ultimatum? The resolution adopted at the plant's party meeeting says that "in the period following the 28th CPSU congress the party's leadership organs, in the shape of the Politburo, the CPSU Central Committee, and its apparatus, have been unable to clearly formulate aims and tasks with regard to extricating the country and the party from the crisis. The Politburo and the CPSU Central Committee, while paying lip service to the need for a market economy, are in fact resisting fundamental transformations in our society. The lack of an efficient, clear party action program that would help consolidate all healthy forces in society has caused Communists to lose confidence in the future. The Solikamsk metallurgists' meeting reckons that the present Politburo, CPSU Central Committee, and its apparatus, having lost touch with the life of the working people, do not express the will of the party masses...."

The final lines of the appeal to party organizations adopted at the plant party meeting attest to the Communist metallurgists' determination. The appeal says, in particular: "We do not want to be members of a party and carry party cards just so that we can pay membership dues, and we suspend our CPSU membership as a whole party organization for three months. At the end of the three months, if our demands are not met, the party organization will cease to exist at the plant."

Leaders Accused of Ignoring Chernobyl Aftermath

LD1607095191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1900 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] A group of the Russian parliamentarians from Bryansk Oblast have appealed to the Congress of People's Deputies to pressure leaders who remain unconcerned by the tragic fate of the victims of a radioactive tornado.

Their appeal, circulated here, stresses that 13 of the republic's oblasts, and Krasnodar Kray, are in the zone contaminated by the Chernobyl nuclear electrical power station [AES] accident. Bryansk Oblast appeared to receive the most contamination.

Parliamentarians are especially concerned by the slow resettlement of citizens from the rayons contaminated by radiation, where a tense social and psychological situation has developed. The appeal asserts that such a situation is caused by the low executive discipline of leaders of a number of organizations and by the position of some republics' councils of ministers and kray executive committees within the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, who do not wish to act on the decisions of the elimination of the aftermath of the Chernobyl AES accident, out of pure parochialism.

Ryzhkov Discusses Failed Presidency Bid

PM1607130591 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jul 91 p 1

[INTERFAX report: "There Was No Time. No Mistakes Either"]

[Text] Nikolay Ryzhkov has stated to the INTERFAX agency that the main cause of his loss at the polls was the brevity of the campaign.

[Ryzhkov] You don't hold that sort of campaign in just 20 days. Furthermore. Throughout the last year the Russian leadership talked constantly of the need for cardinal reforms which would give a quick return. I, on the other hand, stuck to my position in support of moderately radical reforms. People could not really understand these subtleties.

I am convinced that promises of quick results are a deception. It will be revealed all the same. But at the time it was these promises that led to B.N. Yeltsin's victory.

Another reason which did not facilitate a victory by me was my membership in the CPSU. The party is going through a crisis and is being subjected to major attacks, and the fact that I remain a party member had, I think, a negative influence.

The fourth reason was for me completely unexpected. A year had passed since I left the post of chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. However, when during the election campaign I toured the oblasts and remote cities, for some reason I was treated as the head of the present government, I understood this from the questions. And all the discontent, and all the sins of the present cabinet, fell on me.

Belorussia

Trade Agreement With Bulgaria Signed

LD1607090691 Minsk Radio Minsk Network in Belorussian 0300 13 Jul 91

[Text] Belorussia has become the first among the Soviet republics to sign an intergovernment agreement with Bulgaria. This document, consolidated by the signatures of Aleksandur Tomov, deputy chairman of Council of Ministers of the Republic of Bulgaria, and his Belorussian colleague, Vladimir Zalamay, defines the directions of bilateral trade and economic cooperation, and the order of mutual payments. The agreement envisages that by the end of the year the trade turnover between the republics will reach $180 million. Bulgaria will supply Belorussia with equipment for the food industry, for lifting and transporting mechanisms and structures for fresh and conserved vegetable and fruit, enterprises, and for electrotechnical and other goods enterprises. Belorussia will deliver agricultural and household technical devices, [word indistinct] motorcars, potassium [word indistinct] and spare parts.

Ukraine

Kravchuk Consults With City Soviet Deputies

LD1307180191 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 1500 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Text] The place and role of local government bodies in putting the declaration on state sovereignty of the Ukraine into practice was the main subject of a meeting between Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, and chairmen of some city soviets of people's deputies of the republic. The meeting took place in Kiev today.

It was noted that in order to make this important document reality it is necessary to master the mechanism of resolutions and decisions adopted by the Ukrainian parliament. More reciprocal action is also necessary between local executive authorities and the Cabinet of Ministers of the republic. Other important issues connected to the reforming of structure of the executive authorities were also examined at the meeting. The issue of local soviets handling problems beyond their terms of reference was discussed. Leonid Makarovych Kravchuk informed those present of the economic and political situation in the Ukraine, and about relations between the republic and the center and other Union republics.

Comments on Draft Union Treaty

OW1507133291 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 13 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Leonid Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukrainian parliament, has said that the draft union treaty approved in Novo-Ogarevo, treaty on a union of sovereign republics, fails to conform to its name in many points. The draft fails to answer to the declaration of state sovereignty for the Ukraine, he told IF's [INTERFAX] correspondent. Therefore local MPs decided to postpone debates on the draft till this autumn.

"The Ukraine said it wishes to belong to a union of sovereign states. Witness the results of the USSR referendum and the republican poll conducted on March 17: 26 million Ukrainians said 'Yes.' But one must not confuse a union with a document on union," said L. Kravchuk.

At present some people are engaged in juggling, pretending that the results of the referendum are tantamount to the Ukrainian people's support for the draft union treaty. However the facts are different, said the chairman of the Ukrainian parliament. According to him, the people said "Yes" to a new union, a union of states where every republic will be the master of its destiny.

L. Kravchuk said he stands for a one-channel tax system. He believes that all property in the Ukrainian territory should belong to the republic.

[Editorial Note:] Read our interview with the chairman of the Ukrainian parliament Leonid Kravchuk in full in the next edition of "Nation and Society."

Zlenko on Relations With Hungary, Center

LD1407202791 Kiev Radio Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 2200 GMT 11 Jul 91

[Excerpts] A news conference arranged by the Ukrainian Ministry of Foreign Affairs took place in Kiev today. Our correspondent Sergiy Hubin reports.

[Hubin] The news conference was held in connection with the first anniversary of adoption by the national parliament of the declaration on Ukraine state sovereignty. Minister Anatoliy Zlenko noted that it had a determinant role. As a matter of fact some conceptual approaches which were formerly used in relations with others countries by our foreign political department have to be revised.

[Begin Zlenko recording] In accordance with the declaration of state sovereignty, the republic excersises direct relations with other states, recognizes advantages of values common to all mankind over those of the classes, and the priority of generally recognized norms of international law over norms of (?internal state law). The foreign policy of the Ukraine is directed in the first place at strengthening peace and international security, developing friendly, mutually beneficial, and equal in rights relations with other states, in the first place with border states, ensuring the territorial integrity and inviolability of our borders, defending the interests and rights of citizens of the Ukraine abroad, ensuring direct participation in the general European process and European structures, more active participation in the activity of the United Nations and other international organizations, increasing the effectiveness of participation in international cooperation, particularly with the purpose of using all opportunities to their maximum to alleviate the consequences of the Chernobyl breakdown, and to create favorable conditions to establish large-scale cooperation with people of Ukrainian origin and their descendants who live outside the republic's borders. [end recording] [passage omitted]

[Hubin] A number of important agreements with foreign countries were signed. An official visit by Leonid Kravchuk to Hungary was significative in this respect.

[Begin Zlenko recording] The declaration on principles of relations between our countries, the declaration on national minorities, which has no analogue in the diplomatic practice, the Helsinki convention and others—there are ten documents altogether—where there is the actual diplomatic breakthrough and shifting to direct diplomatic relations.

The Hungarian leadership appraised the situation correctly politically and made balanced decisions on time, taking into account existing realities, and should be given a credit. We are now already working on preparing a visit by the minister of foreign affairs of Hungary to the Ukraine which should take place during the first 10 days of August. I think that this will also foster the further establishment of relations between the Ukraine and Hungary. [end recording]

[Hubin] Anatoliy Zlenko tactfully bypassed a point which preceded the visit of Kravchuk, chairman of the Ukraine Supreme Soviet to this country. At that time, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs tried to block the visit of the leader of our national parliament. It was noted in the letter to the Government of Hungary that the Ukraine was part of the Union and it would not be expedient to establish bilateral diplomatic contacts without taking into account the center's interests. However, it is not the case that the center can make our republic pursue the center's own external policy. After all, it has still not confirmed its consent for the Ukraine to take part in the so-called Danube Commission to which, in addition to the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Hungary belong. Who is it in Moscow who puts sticks in our wheels and how influential are these forces? Journalists asked Anatoliy Zlenko.

[Beging Zlenko recording] I think those forces cannot have such great influence to stop us. They exist, they are somewhere on the medium level I would say, but I would like to say to you clearly, openly, and honestly, that we have absolutely no problems arising to the level of leadership. If we encounter some resistance we contact the leadership and settle these issues. [end recording] [passage omitted]

[Hubin] Turkey, Great Britain, and Austria have declared their intention to open general consulates in Kiev. Therefore, according to words of Minister Anatoliy Zlenko, diplomats of the republic have even more work to do. It is directed at the Ukraine occupying a proper place on the world arena.

Defense Minister Receives Polish Delegation

LD1307214991 Kiev Radio Kiev Network in Ukrainian 1900 GMT 13 Jul 91

[Text] Marchuk, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic state minister for issues of defense, national security, and extraordinary situations, received a delegation of the Ministry of Defense of the Republic of Poland. The guests were familiarized with the work of the Cabinet of Ministers of the republic and problems that are being tackled currently. It was noted that the country is interested in further expanding mutually beneficial relations with Poland. In addition to many other directions of cooperation, the opportunity to develop such issues as fighting organized crime, narcotics business, and international terrorism aroused mutual interest. The Polish public, said Grzegorz Kostrzewa-Zobas, deputy director of the European Department of the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, watches attentively the processes of restructuring in the Ukraine; the strengthening of political, economic, and cultural contacts in the context of these processes is in the interest of both states and peoples. Ryszard Polkowski, the Polish consul general in Kiev, took part in the conversation.

Moldova

Alternative Service Law Adopted

PM1507104391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

[Eduard Kondratov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "How To Do Your Civic Duty"]

[Text] Kishinev—The Moldova parliament has adopted a Law "On Alternative Service"—alternative military service.

Henceforth young citizens of Moldova, whose religious or pacifist outlook forbids them to carry arms, may refuse to be drafted into the Army. They can perform their civic duty within the municipal services, in agriculture, the construction industry, in public health and social assistance establishments, and in accident, rescue, and fire fighting subunits. While performing their alternative service, they can also be enlisted for work to eliminate the consequences of catastrophes, natural disasters, and other emergencies.

Moldovan CP Program Released

LD1107091591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1814 GMT 10 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Fedor Angeli]

[Text] Kishinev, 10 Jul (TASS)—The aim of the Moldovan Communist Party [CP] is the real sovereignty of the Republic of Moldova for the sake of all its citizens, a socialist society in which the main humanist strivings of mankind—freedom and justice—will be realized, states the program of the Moldovan CP, the main points of which are published today in republican party organs.

The document stresses that the Moldovan CP favors the development of all forms of property. It regards the work connected with forming a multistructural market economy in the countryside as the principal direction of its agrarian policy. The Moldovan Communist Party thinks that land must not become private property, an object of buying and selling.

The document says that the Moldovan CP promotes the establishment of a viable multiparty political system and, consequently, its own transformation into a party of the parliamentary type. Its policy will be directed toward creating a law-governed state that ensures the supremacy of the law and guarantees that all citizens may take part in running its affairs.

The document points out that Moldova's entry into a union of sovereign states, the preservation of the republic's territorial integrity, and the solving of territorial and other questions by consititutional and democratic means alone, match the fundamental interests of the Moldavian people. The humane resolution of the problems of ethnic minorities will ensure the success of the national revival of the Moldovian people and the genuine sovereignty of the republic.

The document notes that the Moldovan CP will strive to achieve political leadership in society only by lawful democratic means, in the course of elections, and depending on the expressed will and support of the people. Its program takes into account the specifics of each region of the republic and the interests of the various social groups. In its activities it strives to express the interests of the working class, peasantry, and intelligentsia—all those living on earned incomes. Being multiethnic in its make-up, the Moldovan CP sees its main task to become a party of civic concord and cooperation.

The Moldovan CP, the document notes, is an independent political organization having its own program and rules. It is in favor of the voluntary amalgamation of communist parties in the CPSU corresponding to the level of links between the republic's state bodies of power and the center in a renewed Union. The Moldovan CP is establishing businesslike links with foreign parties and movements for the sake of a broad dialogue.

Moldovan News Agency Director Resigns

LD1207181291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1522 GMT 11 Jul 91

[Text] Kishiniv, 11 Jul (TASS)—Rumors that the Moldova-press national information agency is on strike in Moldova have proved premature. It has been learned from reliable sources that the demand of the agency's journalists for the resignation of Vasiliy Vatamanu, its general director, has been satisfied. He decided to quit the post, giving as his reason the fact that it is difficult for him to combine his duties as its head with his duties as a Moldovan people's deputy.

However, the real reason for his departure is the evident incompetence of the general director, who was appointed almost a year ago to manage the republican agency. According to V. Pavlichenko, his first deputy, he was frequently absent from work, did not particularly become involved in it, and engaged in protectionism, hiring people who were incompetent when it suited him.

This case is very typical of the position in respect of leding cadres in Moldova. Since the shameful resignation of prime minister Mircha Druk, a process has started there of a purge of leaders who came into command posts on the wave of events, when high-sounding phrases were valued above deeds. Thus Mircha Snegur, the republic's president, in one of his recent speeches appealed for not just patriotism but professional qualities too to be taken into account when appointing leaders.

Georgia

'Unprecedented Decline' in Production Volume

LD1507182291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1208 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Albert Kochetkov]

[Text] Tbilisi, 15 July (TASS)—An unprecedented decline in the volume of production compared with last year has occurred in the national economy of Georgia.

According to data presented by the socio-economic department of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee, since January output of industrial products in comparable wholesale prices has declined by 25 percent, or by 1.708 billion rubles [R].

The greatest lag has occurred in the production of trucks, tower cranes, main-line electric locomotives, rolled ferrous metals and pipes, ferro-alloys, construction materials, and the extraction of manganese and non-ferrous metal ores.

Experts believe that the deepening of the crisis in Georgia's economy is the result of the destruction of economic ties between enterprises and failure to honor mutual contractual obligations with mixed enterprises from other republics.

The republic's budget deficit for 1991 currently exceeds R3 billion, according to some data, which is more than half of the total budget. For Georgia this means a catastrophe, one of the deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet stated.

Theft of Party Property Highlighted at Plenum

PM1507101391 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Jul 91 First Edition p 5

["Direct Line" report by Colonel L. Arshantsev: "Blatant Lawlessness"]

[Text] Tbilisi—"Depoliticization and departyization in Georgia have become an instrument for the persecution and oppression of the Communist Party," D. Mikeladze, first secretary of the Central Control Commission stated in his report to a joint plenum of the [Georgian Communist Party] Central Committee and the Central Control Commission. The full text of the report, published in the Russian language party newspaper ZHIZN [Life], publicizes incidents of blatant lawlessness regarding the property of Georgian Communist Party organizations. In particular, the report indicates that detachments set up at the local level by various parties and blocs and engaging in theft have, according to statistics as of 1 January 1991, stolen 80 motor cars from Communist Party garages. Of these, 25 cars have still not been recovered.

Some days ago national guardsmen under the command of someone by the name of Lanchav carried out a nighttime raid on the Central Committee's car garage and tried to steal 20 vehicles. The bandits' escapade was successfully nipped in the bud, but the very fact that the raid occured provoked a sharp protest among Communists. A special Central Committee resolution was adopted on this issue.

An equally bad situation prevails regarding the premises of party organizations' leading organs. Extremists have seized by force administrative buildings belonging to rayon and oblast party committees in various cities in the republic. Such actions are, as a rule, accompanied by the theft of property and equipment. "The legal organs are not adopting the necessary measures, in spite of the fact that party committees have appealed to them many times on this subject," D. Mikeladze noted. "It is not just that the crimes have never been cleared up; criminal charges have not even been brought."

Results of Elections to Adzhar Supreme Soviet

LD1507133591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1055 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] Tbilisi, 15 Jul (TASS)—The SAKINFORM agency reports from Batumi that the preliminary results have been assessed of the repeat ballot and the second round of the elections to the Supreme Soviet of the Adzhar Autonomous Republic held on 10 July. The regional organization of the "Free Georgia—Roundtable" political bloc in power in Georgia now has 32 people's deputies' seats, and the Adjar Oblast organization of the Independent Communist Party of Georgia and the "Adzhar" bloc each have 11 seats. Five deputies have been elected from the Adzhar regional organization of the all-Georgian Rustaveli Society, four from the "Economic Revival" bloc and three from the regional organization of the all-Georgian Party of Peace and Freedom (veterans of combat operations in Afghanistan). Independent candidates have gained 13 places.

In the first round held on 23 June, balloting was not held in 35 constituencies. Now only one vacancy for deputy remains, because at one polling station the ballot results were deemed invalid as a result of flagrant violations of the law on elections. A repeat ballot will be held at this polling station.

Thus, no one party has gained an absolute majority of seats in the supreme Soviet of the Adzhar Autonomous Republic.

Armenia

Plan Approved To Negotiate With Azerbaijan

LD1507191691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] We have just received a report from Yerevan. The Armenian Supreme Soviet today endorsed the initiative of the plenipotentiary representatives of the working people of Nagorno-Karabakh [NKAO] who, in their statement of 16 May, expressed their readiness to enter into political talks with the authorities of Azerbaijan and to seek compromise solutions to settle the Karabakh conflict within the framework of the Constitution and the laws of the USSR. A prolonged and lively political discussion preceded the adoption of this document. Taking part in it were representatives of all the deputies' groups and political parties represented in parliament. It was stated at the session that the draft of the adopted document was compiled by Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet.

Interior Ministry Reports Casualties in NKAO

LD1507224891 Moscow Russian Television Network in Russian 2000 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Vesti" newscast]

[Text] The situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast villages with an Armenian population remains tense. We are receiving quite contradictory reports. According to Armenian reports to date there are already four dead and 15 wounded among civilians. The villages of Manashid and Buzluk have ceased to exist. The attacking subunits of the Azerbaijan Special Purpose Militia Detachment and the Soviet Army had, however, to abandon their positions near the village of Erkech. The Armenian Interior Ministry in the border regions is in full combat readiness, and according to unofficial reports the possibility of crossing the Armenia-Azerbaijan border to protect the Armenian population has not been ruled out. The television speech by the republican interior minister confirms such a possibility.

However, the permanent mission of Azerbaijan in Moscow continues to assert that passport checks are still being carried out in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and that there are no casualties nor forcible deportations of Armenians from their villages. By 1700 Moscow time the AZERINFORM agency had no information about this morning's events in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast.

Here is a report from the center. The USSR Interior Ministry has told us that two Azerbaijani militiamen were wounded and that in the course of the operation five grenade launchers, a sub-machine gun, and 40 hand-grenades were surrendered voluntarily. The Internal Troops stationed in the region have no tank and artillery subunits, and are not taking part in operations. The country's Interior Ministry is prepared to confirm this report by documentary evidence, and we hope that in the near future we will be able to show you a film on the passport checks.

Azerbaijan 'Pillaging' of Property Cited

LD1507193191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1346 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Tigran Liloyan]

[Text] Yerevan, 15 Jul (TASS)—A difficult situation remains in Shaumyanovsk (Geranboy Rayon) Azerbaijan. According to a report from the Armenian Interior Ministry, the Azerbaijani Special Purpose Militia Detachment [OMON], with the support of subunits of the USSR Interior Ministry Internal Troops and the Soviet Army, is trying to carry out passport checks in three Armenian villages in the rayon.

The chairman of the Armenian Supreme Soviet reported at a session of the republican parliament today that, according to information received, a gunfight was in progress in the village of Erkech.

Journalists were told at a briefing at the Armenian Council of Ministers on Sunday evening that on 14 July Armenians were forced to leave the villages of Manashid and Buzluk. According to Ashot Manucharyan, acting Armenian minister of internal affairs, "the population of these villages, not wishing to submit to the demands of the Azerbaijani side to move to Armenia, left the villages. The women and children are now in neighboring Armenian villages, and the men have hidden in a nearby forest." Manucharyan also stated that the Azerbaijani OMON had entered the villages of Manashid and Buzluk and pillaging of the Armenians' property had begun. Regarding the village of Erkech, the head of the ministry noted, "its male population has refused to leave the village, military helicopters are circling in the sky and shooting at the forest."

Parliament Discusses Deportations From Azerbaijan

LD1507162891 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Text] Inhabitants of two Armenian villages—Geranboyskiy, formerly Shaumyanovskiy, Rayon of Azerbaijan, Buzluk, and Manashid—were forced to leave their permanent residences over the past weekend. This was reported today at the morning sitting of the Armenian parliament. It was noted that the population's deportation is being carried out under the pretext of checking the passport system and disarming fighters. The operation is being carried out by a group of the Azerbaijan OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment]. Ter-Petrosyan, Armenian Supreme Soviet chairman, declared that the republic's leadership is taking all possible measures to avoid an escalation of violence.

Interior Minister Discusses Border Casualties

OW1607082091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1800 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Armenia's acting Interior Minister Ashot Manucharyan has said at a briefing that fierce clashes near the village of Erkech, Shaumyan district on July 15 between local residents and troops and Azerbaijani special police left two local residents dead and 15 others injured. Early reports say that three Azerbaijani police were killed and 15 others injured. Later, troops and police were withdrawn from the area.

Manucharyan said that the USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov ordered stopping the fire, barring the Azerbaijani police from the village and asking civilians to return home.

The Armenian official said that the command of the Armed Forces has promised there will be no more such actions before President Gorbachev's return from London.

About the problem of Armenian hostages, Ashot Manucharyan said that their exact number was difficult to establish. Some hostages are released and others taken. He said that according to his sources, almost all hostages from Nagorno-Karabakh have been released for big ransoms. The residents of Ngorno-Karabakh have already spent about 4 million rubles for that purpose.

Official Views Deportations in Azerbaijan

LD1607021691 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2041 GMT 15 Jul 91

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] In Armenia an operational headquarters has been set up to deal with emergencies in connection with the fresh exacerbation of the situation in the former Shaumyanovskiy Rayon of Azerbaijan.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V. Nazaryan] (Martunashen), (Bartadzor)—it seems that the names of those destroyed Armenian villages have already started to be forgotten. Now I think you shall hear Erkech, Manashid, Buzluk. It is precisely to the former Shaumyanovskiy Rayon of Azerbaijan that the center of gravity moved after the presidential decree on lifting the state of emergency here. The action surrounding the deportation of the Armenian population from this rayon have taken on an obviously aggressive character. Military subunits disavowed by the country's Ministry of Internal Affair, KGB, Ministry of Defense, and even the Azerbaijan Ministry of Internal Affairs reinfored with tanks and helicopters, are for the second day running demanding that the population leave their native hearths under threat of physical destruction.

A question from the Television News Service: What steps are being undertaken by the leadership of Armenia in this emergency situation?

[A. Manucharyan, acting internal affairs minister of Armenia] First and foremost, these are naturally measures of a political nature; although I have to say that Azerbaijan, for example, is not willing to have any contacts or to take any steps toward a political normalization of the conflict. Alongside the political steps, the position of the republic's leadership is unambiguous—that we cannot stand like an outside observer anymore and allow further violence regarding the Armenian population. [end recording] [video shows Armenian villagers being deported, tanks and helicopters, followed by interview with Manucharyan]

Certification of 'Liberation Struggle' Sought

NC1307144591 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Text] More than 70 Armenian Supreme Soviet peoples deputies have issued a draft document proposing that the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] issue be included as an urgent item on the current session's agenda. The document calls on the Supreme Soviet to recognize the struggle of the Armenian people living in the NKAO as a national liberation struggle. The draft document has been published in the 11 July edition of HAYASTANI HANRAPETUTYUN.

The authors of the resolution, which has been proposed to the Supreme Soviet for passage, believe that the actions of the USSR and Azerbaijani authorities in the NKAO are such that they should be certified as genocide against the Armenian people. They also believe that Armenians living in the NKAO are being forced into acting out of self-defense due to the actions of the USSR and Azerbaijan, that the self-defense units be certified as combatants whose rights are protected by the 1949 Geneva Convention and the 1977 complementary agreement, and that the struggle of the Armenian people living in the NKAO be recognized as a national liberation movement. The resolution's authors also want international organizations, Union republics, world nations, and the United Nations to recognize the Armenian people's national liberation struggle in the NKAO and to recognize the NKAO's administrative organ, the National Council, as a legitimate body under international law and provide relevant help and assistance to the region.

Six Parties Favor Republican Referendum

NC1307090691 Yerevan Radio Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1830 GMT 11 Jul 91

[Text] The representatives of the Armenian Pan-National Movement; Armenia's Republican, Democratic Liberal [Ramkavar Azatakan], National Conservative, and Christian Democratic parties; and the National Self-Determination Association signed a joint declaration yesterday at the Armenian Supreme Soviet concerning the 21 September referendum.

The declaration states: Compatriots, the international situation shaped by the profound political and economic crisis in the Soviet Union offers the Armenian people a unique opportunity to take the pan-national struggle—which was preserved at the cost of its freedom-loving sons' lives and was rekindled by the national liberation struggle—to its logical conclusion and establish a national independent state in the republic.

Following the establishment of the independent political structures, the adoption and implementation of resolute decisions on land privatization, and a series of measures taken for the creation of a democratic system, the referendum on the Armenian Republic's independence is the next important step on the road to establishing an independent state.

Our resolute yes would substantially improve our positions in the international arena, provide opportunities for establishing close political and economic ties with other countries, and force the Soviet leadership to consider the aspirations of the Armenian people.

Only under conditions of independent statehood is it possible to ensure the development and burgeoning of the nation and the realization of the national aspirations. There is no other way out. A "no" would lead to long-term slavery without hope, and in which case an incapacitated people will have to hope for mercy from foreign masters.

Azerbaijan

Interior Ministry Reports Developments

OW1607084091 Moscow INTERFAX in English 0930 GMT 15 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] **Report from Azerbaijan**

According to a report of the Azerbaijani Interior Ministry broadcast over the republican TV on Sunday evening, "According with the USSR President's decree of July 25, 1990 and the ruling of the Azerbaijan Republic's Supreme Soviet of June 28, 1991, the troops of the Azerbaijani Interior Ministry and army units held on July 13 an emergency operation to confiscate weapons and neutralize illegal military formations in the Geranboi district the separatists had developed into a military base". The operation was supervised by the republic's Interior Minister Magomed Asadov.

To avoid a bloodshed, efforts were made to explain the actions to the local population. The demand to surrender weapons and refrain from illegal armed actions was made through loudspeakers. In the village of Erkech the population voluntarily surrendered 8 assault guns, 40 self-made hand grenades, 5 grenade launchers and mortars, 20 explosive devices, etc.

According to the report, the villages of Manashid and Buzlukh have also been cleared of guerillas, and republican police posts have been set up there. Local self-government structures have been revived. The inspection of passport regime continues.

On Sunday the Azeri Interior Ministry also reported that guerillas had twice penetrated Azerbaijan's Lachin district from the direction of the Armenian villages of Ksnaberd, Gadrut region of Nagorno Karabakh and Bayandur and Khoznavar of the Gorisi district of Armenia for attacks on police posts at the villages of Suarasy and Gadzhilar.

Report from Armenia

On the morning of July 15 the Azeri OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] supported by Soviet Army units attacked the village of Erkech and started a pogrom, according to the news agency NORUTYUN SERVICE.

On the previous day, says the Armenian news agency SNARK, they occupied the villages of Manashid and Buzlukh and drove out the villagers into the surrounding woods where they were fired on from helicoper gunships.

The news agency also reports that "the villages have in practice been emptied for the Azeri OMON police to plunder them, and they immediately started pogroms and plunder".

Popular Front Convenes Congress

OW1507135591 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1500 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] Azerbaijan's Popular Front convenes for a congress in Baku on Saturday. The congress is expected to be held in 2 stages. The 1st is to last for 3 days.

The Front's leading body is to deliver a report on the current political situation and finances. Those present will also discuss problems faced by the Azeri national democratic movement and its tasks.

Besides, the congress is planning to adopt a new program for the Front and amend its rules.

During the 2nd stage of the congress, whose time is not defined yet, those present will endorse the composition of the Front's parliament, and elect the Front's chairman, its leading body, inspection commission and editor-in-chief of the front's newspaper "AZADLYG" (Freedom).

The congress is planning to adopt a number of statements and resolutions, including those on the current political situation, on the problem of Nagorno-Karabakh, on the problem of refugees, on discrimination for political reasons, and on events in Baku that took place on January 20, 1990.

Kyrgyzstan

Akayev Interviewed on Draft Union Treaty

PM1607095191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jul 91 Second Edition p2

[Interview with A. Akayev, president of the Republic of Kyrgyzstan, by PRAVDA correspondent Yu. Razgulyayev in Bishkek under the rubric "The Union Treaty: The Republics' Stand"; date unspecified: "Only by Working Together"]

[Text] If I were to sum up the importance of the new Union treaty for our people and the whole country, I would highlight the fact that, for the first time, it recognizes the priority of sovereignty for all the republics which make up the renewed federation. In my view, this truly fundamental condition is the basis for a really viable, lasting Union. After all, we no longer have the situation where someone above bestows rights on the republics: They themselves negotiate the rules and conditions of the community and decide which powers to hand over to the Union and, quite simply, how to lead their lives best.

This would seem to be a simple idea which everyone can understand, but we have reached it with great difficulty. Even in our republic, Kyrgyzstan, there were heated debates at the last session, with mutually exclusive amendments being introduced and all hope of accord sometimes being lost. Nevertheless, the very process of working on the draft treaty taught us to be more tolerant of others' opinions and of the inevitable compromises and persuaded everyone involved in the talks that there is simply no other way open to our peoples.

Another difficulty was that the participants in the Novo-Ogarevo agreements did not follow familiar, preselected patterns. Of course, the draft treaty takes account of the lessons we have been taught by history, including the hardest. But, as a whole, it is a fundamentally new political and economic association of free, sovereign states.

Each member of the future Union brought his own ideas, problems, and concerns to the negotiating table. Recently rereading the proposals drawn up by our Supreme Soviet's special commission, I noted with satisfaction that most of them have been taken into account in the final wording of the draft treaty. I will name just some of them.

The clause about recognizing the immutability of borders established between signatories to the treaty is fundamentally important for the Central Asian republics, for example. The republics' right to suspend USSR laws in their territory if they infringe the treaty or conflict with the Constitution or laws of the republic concerned greatly enhances our sovereignty. Our proposal that the Union parliament's Soviet of the Republics be given the status of an upper chamber has also been taken into account. As a result, no law will come into force until it has been approved by this chamber, where all the republics—even the smallest—have an equal number of votes.

In short, the final wording of the treaty uses everything valuable and useful in the theory of federalism and confederalism and incorporates the best experience of world practice. But we are clearly aware, of course, that the final signing of the new treaty and its implementation in practice are not likely to go smoothly, without any problems. Even in the final stages of the preparatory committee's work, attempts were still being made to preserve strict centralization of state security and prosecutor's office bodies, for example. We are agreeable to extensive coordination and vertical ties between these bodies, but we will not tolerate any attempts to limit our sovereignty. On the other hand, we certainly do not rule out the possibility that all these questions could be settled in agreements supplementing the Union treaty.

There is another point I would like to mention in particular. A fundamentally new aspect of the draft treaty is that it provides for the broad development of direct ties—economic, political, and humanitarian—between the republics: Not via the center, as has been the case in the past, but directly.

The main point is that we have been able to see for ourselves how useful and effective such relations are. With the collapse of the administrative-edict system and the total breach of agreements and contracts, horizontal ties have helped us to keep sectors of the national economy afloat and save whole regions from unemployment. For example, together with the Ukraine we are starting construction of two large cigarette factories to finally destroy the raw material nature of our economy. Russia is giving us a lot of help with improving our finances and we are expanding traditional ties with our neighbors, Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan.

Of course, it would be naive to say that with the signing of the new Union treaty all conflicts in our country will immediately die down, all disputes will be resolved, and the economy will start working efficiently. No, we have a long, hard path to climb out of our deep crisis. But the freedom and sovereignty which the new treaty will give the peoples will restore their dignity, pride, and confidence in the future. We have chosen the path of independence, but now more than ever before we are conscious of our unity with the vast, renewed Union and appreciate that our vital interests are inseparably linked. Only by working together and helping one another will we be able to extricate ourselves from any crisis.

Tajikistan

Democratic Party of Tajikistan Registered

PM1507104191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jul 91 Union Edition p 3

[Aleksandr Karpov report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Democratic Party of Tajikistan Registered"]

[Text] Dushanbe—The Democratic Party of Tajikistan that was formed roughly a year ago has acquired legal status.

Today the Democratic Party of Tajikistan comprises roughly 15,000 people and is the republic's second largest political organization in terms of membership, enjoying prestige within the Congress of Democratic Forces of Central Asia. However, the registration certificate issued to the party by the Ministry of Justice merely states that its existence is legal. Meanwhile, the Democrats still have little influence within the republic or involvement in resolving or even merely discussing socioeconomic problems.

Luchinskiy Comments on Reforms in Central Asia

PM1507141491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jul 91 Second Edition p 4

[Interview with P.K. Luchinskiy, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, by PRAVDA correspondent L. Makhkamov on recent visit to Tajikistan—date, precise place not stated: "Wisdom Does Not Lie in Haste"]

[Text] As has already been reported, P.K. Luchinskiy, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, paid a visit to Tajikistan's Leninabad Oblast. He met and talked with voters. At times these were heated, keen debates on both "lofty" political topics, and "earthbound" topics of daily life.

[Makhkamov] Have you noticed that in the last year or two certain press organs and stage wits have been steadily creating in the public mind a kind of "skull-cap" symbol of conservatism and stagnation mentality [reference to traditional embroidered cap worn in Central Asia]? These jibes are not merely insulting, because they openly imply backwardness on the part of entire peoples, but also, in my view, they are patent lies, since the "jokers" thereby represent themselves as the sole saviors of the Fatherland, regarding other people as "millstones around their necks"...

[Luchinskiy] The "Asian" stereotype was created a long time ago. But life is changing, and it must not be forgotten that the East was the custodian and creator of the great values of civilization. And therefore it seems to me that we should not cling to false stereotypes, but should realistically assess the current processes. I think the representatives of some of our regions, politicians who are used to regarding themselves as models of civilization and radicalism, should cast aside their snobbery and look more closely at Central Asia's experience. I am sure that many of them will be surprised to discover that it is here, in Tajikistan in particular, that the most important perestroyka processes are proceeding more definitely and in more depth: The outlines of a market system are emerging, privatization has begun, joint enterprises are being set up... And all this is taking place in parallel with the responsible fulfillment of commitments to other republics.

We should respect the calm wisdom of the peoples of Central Asia and Kazakhstan and trust it. It is of considerable importance to comprehend and interpret the Central Asian peoples' persistent desire to live in a single Union state and see the CPSU in the vanguard of a transformed Soviet society.

[Makhkamov] Are you sure that the calm, moderate path will prove a shorter route to the goal than the steep, radical path?

[Luchinskiy] Time will tell who is right in the end. I was talking about the fact that in Tajikistan, and apparently throughout Central Asia and Kazakhstan, when they think about progress, they strive to avoid losses and bitter disappointments. And this must not be taken to mean that if someone is not hurrying, he is standing still or going in the other direction.

Here are some illustrations. Let me take just three rayons in Leninabad Oblast. Kanibadamskiy Rayon's "Leningrad" Kolkhoz is negotiating to buy direct from China a production line for the processing of cotton seed. As a result only half the present quantity of seeds will be required for sowing. Incidentally, no one in the country has this technology. The neighboring Isfarinskiy Rayon is making active use—on mutually advantageous terms, of course—of the Tyumen oilmen's assistance in refurbishing the local airport. The Kayrakkum carpet combine is organizing joint production with foreign firms, while a milling combine is opening up virgin lands in Ashtskiy Rayon together with American industrialists.

Many people are now saying that all our difficulties come from the lack of strong executive power. But didn't we have that before? Let us ask ourselves this question: Is it possible that the stability of the situation in Tajikistan and other republics in the region has been preserved precisely because people were in no hurry to get rid of that strong power? The Communist Party and presidential power are acting in one and the same direction, they are complementary.

People in Tajikistan realize that no one is guaranteed against errors. It is important not to repeat them, but to move forward, rather than marking time in an orgy of criticism. People are showing a high degree of self-discipline and responsibility.

[Makhkamov] Unfortunately, there are objective difficulties too...

[Luchinskiy] Yes, I was told about them. Problems have arisen in Tajikistan over the payment of monetary compensation to the population, pensions, and wages, and the realization of social programs has been made difficult, or even totally disrupted. This has happened because certain republics have deviated from the preliminary accords and are not contributing money to compensate for the losses sustained by the raw materials republics.

Dushanbe Orders Dismantling of Nuclear Reactor

LD1507133391 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT 15 Jul 91

[By TADZHIKT-TASS correspondent Galina Gridnyova]

[Text] Dushanbe July 15 (TASS)— A session of the Dushanbe city soviet adopted a decision to dismantle a nuclear plant of "Argus" type in one of Dushanbe's research institutes.

A special investigation, conducted by deputies at the request of the city's residents determined that the design and construction of the institute was carried out without co-ordination with seismologists. At the same time, the building in which the nuclear plant was assembled is located in a seismologically dangerous zone on a territory of extremely unfavourable geological conditions.

Besides that, it turned out that the storehouse for the reactor's fuel had been repeatedly flooded with underground waters. In the course of the construction of the reactor hall, underground communications have been rusted and require repair. The deputies believe that the reason for this are the major violations of the IAEA rules, regulating the design and the construction of units that are potentially dangerous to man and the environment.

Turkmenistan

President Niyazov Discusses Union Treaty

LD1307161791 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 13 Jul 91

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Turkmenia's attitude to the conclusion of the new Union treaty was discussed at a meeting between Turkmen President Niyazov, and journalists and representatives of sociopolitical organizations.

[Begin K. Babayev recording] There is interest in this meeting because the republican parliament was not expected to debate the draft Union treaty. Back in March the people's deputies approved the first version of this document in principle. The present draft was circulated to deputies for discussion in local areas. As Niyazov said, there is no reason to review the decision made in March. The main thing is that the center has de facto recognized the republic's state sovereignty and that the principle underlying the formation of the new Union—namely that the impetus comes from below—has been defined.

The republic's president spoke about his impressions of his recent visit to Italy. This was a special visit. This was the first time that Turkmenistan has made direct business contact with a foreign partner, without Moscow look over its shoulder. The Italian side undertook to build within 32 months a combine for the production of cotton fabric near Ashkhabad and a complex for the production of polyethylene from natural gas at one of the republic's deposits. The Italians will be repaid with finished products. Deals were concluded for the supply of food to the republic.

Turkmenia can only join the future Union as a state that has equal rights with others, one which will have full ownership over its resources. A plenipotentiary delegation has been formed for the signing of the text of the Union treaty. [end recording]

Views Italy Visit, Foreign Ties

LD1107165991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0859 GMT 11 Jul 91

[By TASS correspondent Lyudmila Glazovskaya]

[Excerpts] Ashkhabad, 11 Jul (TASS)—On his first visit abroad as the head of a sovereign state, Turkmen President Saparmurat Niyazov said: "Sovereignty is not a state but a movement toward success and prosperity." Niyazov visited Italy, where he was received by Prime Minister Andreotti. [passage omitted]

"We squandered our riches with an innocence worse than theft," the president said. "Now we are learning to use them carefully. Seventy-five million dollars have already come into the treasury of the republic, which yesterday was literally going around with an outstretched hand."

"By trading with foreign partners at advantageous prices, we not only accumulate capital but create an infrastructure which will be a component of the unified economy of the revived Union. Therefore, everything we undertake in the foreign economic field is also in the interest of the country", the Turkmen president emphasized.

Comments on Union Treaty

PM1107140591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Jul 91 Second Edition p 2

[Interview with Turkmen SSR President S. Niyazov by correspondent M. Volkov, datelined Turkmen SSR; no date of interview given; carried under the rubric "Union Treaty: The Republics' Position" and under the general heading "The Country's Strength Lies in the Unity of Peoples"]

[Text] [Volkov] Saparmurad Atayevich, it has turned out that Turkmenia's parliament has still not approved the draft Union treaty on the Union of Sovereign States. Could you explain what is happening?

[Niyazov] We do not see any urgent necessity for the Supreme Soviet to debate what is just the latest of many versions of the draft treaty. You see, way back in March of this year, the deputies familiarized themselves with one version, and even then the people's elected representatives expressed an unequivocal view. We proceeded and continue to proceed from the wishes expressed by Turkmenistan's voters in the all-Union referendum's results. As you may recall, 90 percent of those who participated voted in favor of the Union. So the corps of deputies resolved at the very beginning of the spring: The Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] should be part of the Union, and the signing of the new Union treaty should reflect the people's will. Both these principles are in line with the vital interests of Turkmen and of our republic's entire multinational population. That very session formed a representative plenipotentiary delegation of the Turkmen SSR, which the corps of deputies empowered to reach further agreements and to sign the Union treaty's final text. And since this delegation has worked very painstakingly on the recently published draft, we can state with utmost responsibility that the document on the whole lives up to our expectations. It only remains to add a few minor touches and we will sign it.

[Volkov] What do you see as the advantage of the new treaty, and what does it give Turkmenistan?

[Niyazov] About three or four years ago we could not even have dreamed of a treaty such as this, which recognizes the genuine state sovereignty of peoples instead of the notorious right to self-determination. By signing the treaty, we will become a founder state of the Union, possessing complete and full political power. Now we can determine our national-state and administrative-territorial structure by ourselves, as well as our system of organs of power and administration.

But I am not going to cite the draft's articles. The readers themselves are probably quite familiar with them by now. I will talk about something else. It has recently become almost fashionable to criticize perestroyka and the serious transformations which are taking place in the country. But let us be impartial and look at all of this calmly and objectively.

I think that perestroyka's great merit is that it has untied the people's hands, and they now have a chance to decide their own fate autonomously. At last the land, its mineral and other natural resources, and its flora and fauna have passed into to the possession of the republics as sovereign states.

And I am sure that now that, enjoying the same rights as other peoples of the planet, our people will really roll up their sleeves and get down to working no worse than, say, people in Canada or Sweden. Especially since our land has neither been denuded of natural resources nor of talent. I saw this for myself yet again during a visit to Italy. People in the West have a lively interest in sovereign Turkmenia, its rich mineral resources, and the products we produce.

And the other sovereign republics of our renewed federation will get on their feet more quickly and overcome the economic crisis in the conditions created by the new Union treaty. The most-favored-nation status in the economy will also help in this respect those who sign the treaty. And if we stand firmly on our own two feet, the Union will not lose its might either.

[Volkov] By the way, what will the new treaty give the Union?

[Niyazov] Clarity and certainty. The draft clearly outlines the Union's powers; the center will no longer have to get "bogged down" in trifles, or in duties which are outside its province following the republics' adoption of declarations of sovereignty. I think that the grounds for twisting and turning will disappear, and the grating "war of laws" will cease.

[Volkov] Do you consider that the new Union treaty is a panacea for all our ills?

[Niyazov] It is a serious step forward from the edge of the precipice where we had ended up. And I am impressed by the fact that the draft reads: "The present treaty or its individual provisions can be rescinded, amended, or supplemented." In other words, the door to improvement is not closed tightly.

Uzbekistan

KGB Denies Contacts With Muslim Leader

OW1507143391 Moscow INTERFAX in English 1230 GMT 12 Jul 91

[Transmitted via KYODO]

[Text] The chief of the Uzbekistani KGB's Public Relations Department, Lt.-Col. Rikhsitullah Akramov, has denied that the KGB stays in contact with the head of the Muslim Board of Central Asia, Mufti Muhammad Sodik.

In his interview with IF [INTERFAX], R. Akramov emphasised that "the church is separated from the state in this country, and the State Security Committee, being a state-run organization, does not interfere in the spiritual life of Muslims."

The Kurultai (congress) of Muslim community representatives in Tashkent on July 5 brought up the subject of close cooperation between the Muslim Board and the KGB, the employment of KGB men by the Board (specifically, as director of the department for the Board's affairs and his assistant), and the planting of KGB agents in mosques. The congress ruled to replace the Mufti of Central Asia from the post of head of the Muslim Board for his contacts with the KGB, violation of Islamic norms, and financial malpractices. The Mufti's supporters have been trying to have the ruling canceled.